

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

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. William Sloane Coffin, Jr., observed: 'It is terribly important that we do not divorce the personal from the political. Either one divorced from the other spells a catastrophe. Spirituality and politics together hold promise for the future. Let us pray. Almighty God, we open our hearts to Thee this day for guidance and direction, that we may carry on the business of this House of Representatives with considered despatch. Though the hour is late, may we carefully and prayerfully weigh our decisions with a balance of equity and justice that such as we do here enact into law will be for the greatest good of the people of this State of Illinois and in harmony with Thy everlasting law; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Roman Kosinski, the Pledge of Allegiance."

Kosinski: "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, for liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Everybody in the Chamber on the Roll Call? Hurry up, get over there. Take the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2210. Representative Simms."



Simms: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I have a Conference Committee Report on my desk on Senate Bill 1325 which is in violation of the House rules which require that the signatures of the Members, their names be typed underneath. I don't know how somebody could read the handwriting of some of these people or who the conferees are. It's in violation of the House rules and I would appreciate it if it would be enforced immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk advises that the problem is that the typist can't read it either."

Simms: "Well, I'm being serious now."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I think you're absolutely correct."

Simms: "I'm not...I think in the future they really should put the names on."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're absolutely right. But I don't know how we can...Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, the Senate doesn't have the same rules, that's part of the problem. But I'll be glad to read the names off to you, in case you can't. Harry Leinenweber is probably the hardest to read, he has such a long name. I think he should be a doctor the way he writes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Simms is casting disparities upon my signature. If he thinks that's bad, he hasn't seen mine yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, 2210. We will...we will ask the people that are handling the Conference Committees to try to improve on that. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2210."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'



have it, the motion carried and the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2210. Any other nonconcurrences? Nonconcurrences. If you don't call them, well they have to get over to the Senate and possibly back again. Representative Yourell. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Senate Bill 133. I would move to nonconcur in that if you call that."

Speaker Redmond: "You refuse to recede, is that what you want to do?"

Daniels: "Refuse to recede on the point of...Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Nonconcurrency, Senate Bill 133, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I refuse to recede in House Amendments and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 6 of Senate Bill 133. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the House refuses to recede. Any other Member have a Bill in which they...Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur..."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the Bill number?"

Yourell: "1768."

Speaker Redmond: "What is it?"

Yourell: "House Bill 1768."

Speaker Redmond: "1768."

Yourell: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Appearing on page 6. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1768 and to ask for a Conference



Committee to be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1768 and that a Conference Committee be appointed. Those in favor...those in favor of the motion say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. We refuse to...we/^{non-}concur in Senate Amendment 1...2. No the Senate does that. Representative Robbins. Representative Mahar, will you please sit down?"

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I have House Bill 1083. All the Amendment did is correct some spelling and I would appreciate concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Which one is that you say?"

Robbins: "1083."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll give it a whirl. House Bill 1083. Representative Robbins moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1083. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McPike. McPike."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, we don't know what this is. The Gentleman didn't explain it and I really do think it's silly to move to concurrence when there's not fifty people on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "He said it corrected spelling. Would you explain the Amendment again, Representative Robbins. I agree with you but if it's only a spelling correction..."

Robbins: "The word 'liquefied' was misspelled and the... soluble ~~porash~~, the K₂O was left off of the Amendment. That's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question... the Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'aye' and 0 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1083.



Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder since we still don't have enough Membership if we could move to the Order of Constitutional Amendments to read the Third...the Second time and just move it to Third Reading.

Speaker Redmond: "Not with this sparse attendance."

Totten: "All we want to do is move it to Third Reading. It's been amended, it has to be read."

Speaker Redmond: "Give me a few more bodies and then we will. If I do it, sure as sin, somebody will say I committed a mortal sin and I couldn't let that happen. It's only a venial, J.J. Wolf says. 1382. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 and 4 on House Bill 1382."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 1382. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4. I know but I'll get to it. 591. 591, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur in the Senate Amendments. For some reason, instead of tabling Amendment #1 and leaving the Bill clean as it left the House, the Senate instead restored the language of the Bill as it left the House in Amendment #2 by deleting Amendment 1. I move for concurrence. There's no substantive change from the Bill at all. In fact, there's no change at all in the Bill from the way it left the House."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your motion again? There's two Amendments here."



Stuffle: "To concur in both Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 of House Bill 591. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want anyone to think I'm rising against the Bill, I'm not. But it really... the Senate Amendment does absolutely nothing. Senate Amendment 2 takes out Senate Amendment 1. So we've got two Senate Amendments, the net result of which is to place the Bill in the same condition that it left the House. And I just can't understand it."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...it's been my observation, I don't really know how we're going to handle this thing. But it would seem to me that part of the problem we have, if not the major problem, is the tendency to... the second Chamber to amend the Bill and many times the Amendment doesn't amount to a hill of beans. Now we really had our Calendar in excellent shape. And everybody was concerned that we wouldn't have enough to do and it was what the Senate was going to do to us that caused my alarm. If we...some of these Amendments are absolutely nonsensical. Now how we can correct that in the future, I haven't the slightest idea. But if we only had the three substantive changes, significant changes on the work that we did on our Calendar we would have finished the week...or ten days early. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "A suggestion, Mr. Speaker, as to how we could remedy that is just to abolish the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen has moved that we abolish the Senate. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. 593. We've got...oh, are we still on this one. Take the record. On this



question there's 108 'aye' and 4 'no' and the motion carries and the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 591. 593. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, the Senate Amendment #1 to 533 (sic) merely provides, as we have provided in the other pension systems, for termination of membership in the pension systems of CETA employees who are federally funded. And I move for adoption... or concurrence, rather, with Senate Amendment #1 to 593. This is consistent with...as I said, what we've done in other systems, consistent with what we did with most systems in a Bill sponsored by Representative Terzich which passed this House, I believe, unanimously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "Does this permit CETA employees to be in part of our pension system?"

Stuffle: "No, the opposite, Dwight, it takes them out as did Representative Terzich for most of the other systems."

Friedrich: "I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 611. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Take the record. On this question, 118 'aye' and 0 'nay'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 593. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, on page 9, Senate Bill 375. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, on Senate Bill 375 I move that the House refuse to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 375 that Committee on Conference be appointed."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendments 1 and 4...is that correct, Representative Stuffle? Those in favor vote 'aye'...say 'aye' and those opposed vote...say 'no'. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the House refuses to recede from Amendments 1 and 4. Senate Bill 375. Representative Walsh is in the Chamber. 1158. The Order of Concurrence. 1158, Representative Bell. It's on page 4. Representative Bell."

Bell: "1158, Senate Amendment 1, just again does some more clarification. And it says that when it's necessary to raise or lower assessments within a county, that the Supervisor of Assessments has that power. That was a recent court order in Winnebago County that said that...that could be interpreted that nobody had that power to equalize assessments and this is to equalize them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "I'm sorry, that's okay. I misunderstood the number."

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

Bell: "I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in...Representative Brummer. Brummer."

Brummer: "I'm not sure if the...if the Sponsor explained this. If he did, I apologize, but I didn't hear it and I'd like to hear the explanation of what the Senate Amendment does."

Bell: "All right. What it does, Representative Brummer, is that when it's necessary to equalize assessments between or within townships or within different classes



of property, whether it be up or down, that we give that power to the township assessor, Supervisor of Assessment or Board of Assessors."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "And that is the function...currently there are provisions in the statutes that...which authorizes a county to...certain population size to request a township multiplier. That is the...that is the current law. And that township multiplier is then applied by the Department of Local Government Affairs as a result of the statistical data that has been submitted to them. Would this then authorize the Supervisor of Assessments to apply that township multiplier? Is that what I understand?"

Bell: "I'll be honest, I can't answer that. The reason that I was told that they had to put this Amendment on was that there was a...an order entered in the Winnebago County Circuit Court which could be interpreted as saying that the Supervisor of Assessments could not increase individual assessments or decrease them by a percentage to raise or lower them to the statutory level. Now what this is supposed to do is allow them the power to raise or lower them to the statutory level."

Brummer: "Our resident expert on many things, Cal Skinner, is standing over there appearing to look attentively and occasionally professes to have some expertise with regard to assessments. Maybe he could respond."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1158. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1



to House Bill 1158. 611...on page 3, Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 611 is a...amends the Park District Code to prohibit board members from having any interest in any contract with the Park District and it provides exceptions similar to those from municipi...it provides exemptions similar to those for municipal officials. And what the Senate did, it struck all the language of the Bill and it just put in the Sections that would refer to the Municipal Ethics Code. And so the Park District board members or trustees or whatever they would be, would have the same code of ethics as municipal officials....city municipal officials. It's a very simple Bill. It has no opposition. I move for its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 611. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 0 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 611. It's been called to the attention of the Chair that...in case Representative Ebbesen and Representative Walsh got mixed up, one of you has the other one's coat and the other one has the other one's pants. Will you stand up, Representative Ebbesen, and see if that isn't the case? See. And Bluthardt too. Who's got the other coat? 2436... J.J....Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2436 corrects another problem that occurred in the Senate. Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2436 strikes everything after the enacting clause and



replaces this Bill with House Bill 2655, word for word. The reason this was necessary is that this Bill got caught in the switches over in the Senate. The Senate Sponsor wanted to see that this Bill did pass. Senate Bill 2655 increases the loan size limit of the Illinois Consumer Finance Act from fifteen hundred dollars to three thousand. It earlier passed the House by a margin of 118 to 19. And, as I said, it's exactly word for word encompassed in this Bill and I would move for its adoption. I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment # 1 and 2 on House Bill 2436."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I thought the Sponsor referred to two different numbers and there's a number up on the board and..."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Pullen: "What Bill are we on?"

Speaker Redmond: "2436."

Pullen: "He said some other number while we was..."

Hannig: "What is happened is..."

Pullen: "...talking and it's very confusing."

Hannig: "What has happened is this. House Bill 2655, another Bill, was lost over in the Senate. On Second Reading it was amended into this Bill by striking everything after the enacting clause. What has happened is the Senate lost this Bill over there, they're trying to keep this Bill alive by putting it in this Bill. It's the same Bill that we had earlier passed out of the House, 118 to 19, but because of the rules it has to come back here for concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I'm still a little...maybe foggy this morning, but this Bill started out to provide that failure to comply with specific disclosures of loan information was to be either a business offense or a Class A



misdemeanor. . . Then Amendment #2 in the House added a new Section to the Consumer Finance Act specifying the extent of liability of a licensee. Senate Amendment #1 apparently added an addition, knowingly violating any of the provisions of this particular Bill would cause the person to be guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. And then #2, deleting everything apparently, added a new Bill increasing the size of loans permitted to be made by those engaged in...in the business of consumer finance. Is that the chronology so far?"

Hannig: "Yes, Sir. Amendment #2, as I stated...Senate Amendment #2 is identical to House Bill 2655 which we passed, went to the Senate, did not get a hearing in Committee."

Leinenweber: "Who was the Sponsor of 2655?"

Hannig: "The Sponsor of that...House Sponsor was Representative McClain and the Senate Sponsor was Senator Knuppel."

Leinenweber: "Was that a Bill that was supported by the consumer loan industry?"

Hannig: "I believe that it was. I don't see..."

Leinenweber: "Okay, now the sole Bill then is Senate Amendment #2, is that right?"

Hannig: "That is correct. That is what we're looking at."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Maybe I can explain a little bit to Representative Leinenweber. What had happened, 2655 was supposed to be heard in the Senate's Financial Institutions Committee the very last day of Committee hearings. The Committee was canceled so Representative Demuzio agreed to add the Bill, 2655, which the Committee was in favor of to this Bill. That's what happened."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2436. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2436. 2226. 2226, Representative Reilly or Yourell or Griesheimer. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would prefer the reference to me as Field Marshal. I am appearing before you today with the last and probably the most critical of the war announcements. We have some very serious matter to discuss here. I claim this as a matter of personal privilege, the privilege of all of the citizens of the State of Illinois. Overnight, two critical factors have developed, Mr. Speaker, that I'm sure you were not aware of. I now have factual proof to show that the Mississippi Mauraders have invaded the State of Illinois. The Mississippi Mauraders have made advancements into Morris, Illinois and are now trying to contrive the immediate withdrawal of business from Morris. This is worse than any atomic dumping plant they have near them because pretty soon that might be the only thing they have in that area. That's the only thing Mississippi doesn't want from Morris. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, we have developed a fourth front in this heinous economic war. It was announced late yesterday on a twix received from headquarters that we have lost the new Caterpillar Tractor Plant to the State of Indiana, our prior friends. And here we are, we have lost. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to wait for your official authority but, Mr. Speaker, I was compelled to move quickly and swiftly. So, Mr. Speaker,



I appear before you today to give you the report on what we did after we adjourned last night. Mr. Speaker, I have taken control as Field Marshal, I have requested, I have requested a number of the Members of this General Assembly to participate in this most holiest of economic wars. Although I realize it is to your immediate direction and control we should have succumb, it was necessary to take swift action so I immediately conferred with a number of these Members and made the following appointments which I now present to you for your concurrence. I have requested General Mahar to take over the armies. General Mahar, do you accept this appointment? Mr. Speaker, we do indeed, we do indeed need a recruiter par excellence, someone that will go to the very heart of the problem when you a military, and that is veteran's benefits. So, who else, we went to General DiPrima. You must, indeed, in today's military network have someone that has training as being ruthless, a terrorist, someone that will go in and fight to the last tooth and toenail. And who did we get? The former Marine, known throughout the State of Illinois, General Polk. But what would a land force be worth without an outstanding military aircraft? We have one of the finest trained military pilots known to man, receiving his training augustic academy on the East Coast, I have appointed General McPike Chief Naval Air Attack Force to attack the Mississippi Coast. We must, indeed, have a fine naval force since some of our sister states border us on rivers and on lakes. I went to General Wolf and asked him if he will immediately take over the PT Attack Force of the Wisconsin Coast line. In a spirit, in a spirit of bi...I was going to say bisexual but that would come out wrong, wouldn't it?



Well in any case, in the spirit of getting everyone into the act, especially when you consider the Air Force recently designed a uniform for pregnant members of the Air Force, I thought it only appropriate to look to one of our Ladies to lead one of our general battalions. Who could be better than General Oblinger, Chief of the Expeditionary Force, into Kansas? Now we need an attack force that no one can stand up to, either the Kansas Mauraders, the Mississippi whatever they're called and the Wisconsin wise guys that have moved into Lake County. We have a force so formidable no one can stand up to him, we have General Pouncey Taylor, former Marine. And it's Taylor Pouncey and I'll never get that name straight. At least he doesn't call me Griesheimer Ronald. Mr. Speaker, I now ask leave for all of my Generals to accompany up to the bench. We would ask you to become our Commander in Chief and lead us into battle."

Speaker Redmond: "Sieg Heil . Representative Jones."

Jones: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I think we should have a round of applause for our true veteran, Webber Borchers."

Speaker Redmond: "Are we all committed to this economic war? I guess you better take over, Representative Griesheimer...General Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "We have decided that in years past, the Field Marshal , sometimes called the desert fox of that famous band of marauders in Northern Africa, had done such a superb job that I have now adopted the pseudonym of the prairie fox. We will attack Wisconsin. In fact, I am very pleased to report to you that any of you wishing to go^{to}/Lake Geneva this summer, it is now part of Lake County, Illinois. As soon as General Oblinger finishes her advancements



into Kansas, I can assure you, at least a portion of the State of Illinois will be dry and you won't have to worry about the twenty-one year old drinking problem any longer. And to those of you who like to play tennis, a few on this side, some outstanding tennis players, I can assure you that Mississippi as the furthest Southern county will make Bob Winchester's desire to increase the Department of Conservation insatiable from now on. And with regard to Indiana, they think they took the Caterpillar Tractor Factory away from us. But I assure you, soon Indiana will be considered as close to us as East Chicago. And we will...we will succumb to their entire manufacturing desires and put them entirely into our state tax coffers. So to all of you, and I'm sure as General DiPrima would say, 'Sign up right away. We need you'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since it's my district that's losing this business and being a retired member of the Selective Service Board 1-80 and Field Marshall Griesheimer suggesting that we enlist Members, I would like to suggest that you come to my office and be drafted. We need lots of recruits."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I think it is your duty as Commander-in-Chief to remove Griesheimer since he allowed Indiana to take our little cat and drawl across the river and take my son-in-law and my grandchildren with it. I understand that they have planned forty years of holding this, we must get it back. And I also ask you to direct General Griesheimer to drive the stakes back into the ground at Mt. Vernon on Gould factory, 'battery factory' before they...even if he has to go to Kentucky to get them. So I think we



should consider Kentucky as our enemy as they are taking Gould away from our district."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess we were on 2226. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm disturbed. I am stockholder in the Caterpillar Tractor Company and they will make more profits in Indiana than they will in Illinois and I wonder where the consciencious objectors sign up."

Speaker Redmond: "2226, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hate to try to follow that act and I have nothing to contribute to the war at this point. But on House Bill 2226...House Bill 2226, as it left the House, was an agreed Bill between the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules and the Governor's office making several changes in our procedures. The Senate did nothing to the original purpose of it. However, as I reported to you yesterday on House Bill 1196, some changes that we made in that Bill dealing with economic impact analysis had to...required a corresponding change in House Bill 2226, that is Senate Amendment #2. And I would ask for concurrence in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2226."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly has moved for concurrence on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2226. On that, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Reilly: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "He'll yield."

Pullen: "In my analysis it says this Amendment limits the request for economic analysis to the Joint Committee. Without this, anyone could have requested the agencies to prepare the economic analysis. What's wrong with that?"



Reilly: "Well, I don't know that there's anything wrong with it. It went further...there's no requirement on the agency's part currently to prepare economic analysis. In the terms of the agreement that we made on the Bill, we agreed to limit it to a request by the Joint Committee. But there is a process, in fact, several agenc...several groups including the Chamber of Commerce and manufacturers have frequently used it whereby they raise questions with the Joint Committee or Members of the Joint Committee and we proceed to have our staff get that information. So I think the effect is that...is the same. But...the analysis is correct in that that's the difference between Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2. But the overall effect of the Senate Amendment is to make it possible for the Joint Committee, at least, to get that information."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, are you seeking recognition on this Bill? Your light is on. No, all right. Representative Reilly has moved for...that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2226. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2226. House Bill 2678. Representative Daniels. By the way, for the information of the... of the House, we postponed the Order of Entertainment until tomorrow and if anybody can beat that last act I think it's John Cullerton. So everybody stick around tomorrow. The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin."



Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Bill that abolishes judgments by confession. The Senate has decided in their good judgment; they think this Bill should be limited only to consumer transactions. Consumer transactions are defined as a sale, lease, assignment, loan, or other disposition of an item of goods, a consumer service, or an intangible to an individual for purposes that are ^{primarily} personal, family, or household. This is primarily the area in which judgments by confession most regularly are abused, and I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2678."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, a question for the Sponsor if she will allow it."

Breslin: "Certainly."

Skinner: "Was...did the original Bill abolish confessions of a judge...judgment for renters? This one still abolishes confessions of judgment in those incredibly bad leases."

Breslin: "Exactly."

Skinner: "Thank-you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Further discussion, if not, the Lady... I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Breslin: "Yes."

Friedrich: "As you know..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Excuse me one moment, all unauthorized personnel off the floor. I've been told that there are some here. Thank-you. Continue Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "As you know, most lending institutions use a judgment 'no', which is a confession of judgment. Now, are these abolished where there is no merchandise in-



volved, it's a direct loan of money?"

Breslin: "The Amendment refers to sales, leases, assignments, and loans when it's to an individual for/^{the} purposes that are primarily personal, family, or household. So if you've gone in to get a loan from a bank for your business, that would not be included in here. But if it's something that's primarily personal, family, or household, it would be included."

Friedrich: "Then Mr. Speaker, I'd have to oppose the Bill. Again, here is a tool that's used by the lending agencies to guarantee payment of the loan. It certainly would... it saves the business of going into trial, and so on, on to get judgment and eliminates a lot of expense. Now, it sounds like you're protecting the consumer, but all you're really doing is running up the cost to him and making it more difficult for him to get a loan. Every time you take away the security, the lenders ability to secure himself on a loan, you eliminate a certain group of borrowers. Now, I'm sure that's not the intent of the Sponsor, but that's the net result of it. So you have to decide what you want to do. You're really hurting the people you're trying to help."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Okay, I would urge you to reconsider your motion and move to nonconcur. The purpose of this Bill, I think I'm one of the Sponsors of it, is to eliminate something that is unfair, to eliminate something that allows a judgment to be taken against someone without notice and without exposing, in a lot of cases, due process. It is something/^{that} is long overdue. Almost every other state in the union that has these Bills, not Bills,...but has acted on the subject, has abolished it all together, and I think that we ought to say that our concept originally was right, and that we ought to hold out and let a Conference Committee work with it. I don't



think it makes sense to abolish it as to one/^{type on} transaction and not as to the other, because the issue is still the same. The issue is, can you go into court, have someone else, an attorney, I guess always an attorney, sign a confession of judgment for you and be liable for vast amounts of money without ever knowing you...of an alleged breach. And I just think...I just think it ruins the concept of the Bill to apply it to anybody. I would certainly urge you to reconsider and move to nonconcur."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Breslin: "Yes."

Piel: "Peg, does this deal with mortgage contracts also?"

Breslin: "Not only, no."

Piel: "No, you say not only, but it does deal with mortgage contracts."

Breslin: "It can. It deals with sales, lease, assignment, loans, or other disposition of an item of goods, a consumer service, or an intangible to an individual for the purposes that are primarily personal."

Piel: "Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank-you Mr. Speaker. This type of motion puts me somewhat in the quandry. It's the old case where, what I consider quite a bad Bill is made considerably better by the Amendment, and because of the mood of, what I perceive to be, the General Assembly, what the General Assembly's mood is, as I perceive it to be, that this Bill will probably pass anyway. I would rise in support of the Ladies motion. For some of the reasons...the reasons enunciated by Representative Friedrich and many others, the much maligned judgment confession...provision in our laws is really quite good. ~~It serves a very, very useful purpose in saving money~~



to consumers and to lenders by decreasing the complexity of legal action necessary for a collection of just debts, and elimination, of course, has the contrary effect. It increases the cost of litigation which ultimately is passed on to all consumers who must borrow money. Now, by eliminating the commercial transactions from the Bill, we have eliminated those persons who are sophisticated and who know exactly what they're doing when they sign a note which contains the confession clause. There is really no reason in the world why we should legislate, again, what two individuals, or two businesses can agree among themselves to do. If they want to give up certain rights in order to obtain some money in the form of a loan, then I think they really ought to be able to do so under the terms that they individually consider to be to their best interest, and we shouldn't continually, down here in the Legislature, try to protect people from themselves. It's bad policy and ultimately increases costs to those people who pay back their just debts. Because the people who don't pay them...that's very much a factor in the cost of doing business and must be spread across those who do repay it. The Bill was quite bad when it left here. It's still not a good Bill, but it's considerably better, and I reluctantly urge an 'aye' vote on this concurrence."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Wayne County, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Question. Will the Sponsor yield for question?"

Breslin: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "She indicates she will."

Robbins: "Does this mean, under this Bill, that if I go into a furniture store and buy \$3000 worth of furniture and refuse to pay for it, that you cannot get a confession judgment."

Breslin: "That's correct. In order to enter a judgment against you, they would have to give you notice and allow



you to appear in court to prevent defenses, before they could enter a judgment against you."

Robbins: "Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels:"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, as a joint Sponsor of House Bill 2678, I urge your favorable consideration and your support of the motion to concur. I point out to you that over the past few years there have been increasing concerns about the Constitutional due process rights of judgment debtors under several procedures. The Illinois Supreme Court has noted that Illinois courts are attempting to undermine the doctrine of confession of judgment in any case. What we have in front of us is an abolition of a portion of the confession of judgment provision dealing with consumer contracts. I think it's a logical approach. I think it's a realistic one, and in line with the recommendations of the Illinois Supreme Court when they recommended to the Legislative Body in their annual report, that we abolish confession of judgment clauses. I think that the Amendment in the Senate has improved the Bill, and I, without any reluctance whatsoever, urge you to consider favorable support for its passage."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin. I'm sorry, Representative Pierce has his light on. The Gentleman from Lake."

Pierce: "I had a little trouble hearing, but Representative Breslin, wherever you may be now, you're not on the Republican side any more, you're on the Democratic side, over there. This is not...the Senate Amendment would authorize confession of judgments on leases even with individuals. Is that correct?"

Breslin: "It would authorize?"

Pierce: "Yes, your Bill abolishes confessions of judgments on leases. Am I right? As it passed the House?"



Breslin: "The Bill as it passed the House abolishes confession of judgment as to all people. The Senate Amendment..."

Pierce: "Authorize certain confessions of judgment..."

Breslin: "Only with regard to commercial transactions. With regard..."

Pierce: "How about leases?"

Breslin: "...With regard to leases as it involves individual consumers, they are abolished. Under Senate Amendment..."

Pierce: "Now, what's an individual consumer? Say I'm an individual who runs a store. What am I then?"

Breslin: "If you have gotten the lease, in order to be involved in a business practice, then the judgment by confession clause can still be enacted by the lending institution which you are involved with."

Pierce: "But not an apartment lease."

Breslin: "No, not an apartment lease."

Pierce: "Or not a lease on a home."

Breslin: "Correct, anything having to do with a personal, family, or household item."

Pierce: "Well, I think that's a good Amendment, and I agree with the Gentleman from DuPage. For a change, he's here backing you up, and primarily personal, family, or household still would be prohibited to have a cognizant or confession clause in the lease, and I think the Amendment makes sense, and I intend to support you on your motion for concurrence."

Breslin: "Thank-you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2678?'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 20 'nays', one answering present, and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2678. 2194, House Bill 2194. The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape."



Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move at this time that the House concur with both Amendments to two House...to House Bill 2194. The first Amendment is a substantive Amendment. It makes changes in the procedure and the mechanics of the Bill. Under the original Bill if a Supervisor of Assessment refused or did not notify the tax assessor within five days that he was going to come back into the township, all changes and assessments would be invalidated. Under Amendment 1 this is stricken from it. Also stricken from it is the provision from the original Bill, the provision that the Supervisor of Assessment must notify the individual tax assessors or taxpayers by mail. And Amendment #2 is just a technical Amendment. So I would move at this time that the House concur with both Senate Amendments to 2194."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Slape moves that the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2194. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'... voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 answering 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2194. We are now going to the Order of Nonconcurrency on page...pages 9 and 10 for certain Sponsors who are going to refuse to recede so we can set us some Conference Committees. Senate Bill 88. Rep...the Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we placed on our Amendment in the House Committee with the approval of the Senate Sponsor and...it was the only way the Bill got out of Committee. And...some reason when it got over to



Senate he refused to concur with our House Amendment. And I've talked to the Chairman of the Committee and he has advised me for us to keep our word. We ought to ask for a Conference Committee and refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and ask for a Conference Committee to be created. So I would so move."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McClain moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 88 and requests the formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. And the House does refuse to recede to Senate Amendment...House Amendment #1. Senate Bill 257. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is the coyote Bill. Bus Yourell put on an Amendment as you know that restricted the time...restricted the time of hunting and gave the Department of Conservation some powers. The Senate Sponsor refused to accept our Amendment. And so I would now move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and to request a formation of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, has moved to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 257 and asks formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. House Bill 263...Senate Bill 263. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 289 and request the appointment of a Con...oh, excuse me, 263 and request the appointment of a



Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Griesheimer moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 263 and asks formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. And the House does refuse to recede on House Amendment #1 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. 577. The Lady from Lake, Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Senate refused to accept any House Amendments to the appropriation for the Institute of Natural Resources. I refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 9 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reed moves to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 9 to Senate Bill 577 and requests a formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 9 to Senate Bill 577 and Conference Committee will be appointed. 9...Senate Bill 918, Mulcahey. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move the House not recede from Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 918 and would request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mulcahey moves to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 918 and asks formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 918 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 927, Representative Beatty. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Beatty moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 927 and a Conference Committee...be requested. The..those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 927 and a Conference Committee will be formed...appointed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman, I rise for an announcement. Mr. Speaker, could we have the attention of the Body. Could we have the attention of the Body for an important announcement? Mr. Speaker...maybe Field Marshal Griesheimer would like to make the announcement. The Speaker plans to recess from 2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. this afternoon. The purpose of the recess is to allow for the meeting of the Conference Committees. Therefore, the Speaker wishes to encourage anyone with a Bill on the Calendar who wishes to take that Bill into a Conference Committee to put the Bill number on a list with the Speaker at this time and move the Bill into the Conference Committee immediately so that we can begin the mechanism of appointing a Conference Committee and then plan for the Conference Committees to meet between 2 and 3:30 this afternoon. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you. A further announcement. The Senate will also be recessing at the same time. Senate Bill 973, Peters. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Senate Bill 973 is the...the new Abuse and Neglective ...Neglected Child Reporting Act which we passed. We accepted an Amendment here offered by Representative McClain which the Senate ^{now} does not accept. I talked to Representative McClain. The best way to get our problems ironed out is to move not to recede from the



Amendments so that we can it in a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Peters moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 6, 7, and 8 on Senate Bill 973. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House refuses to recede from 6, 7 and 8 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 590. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen, we're on 590. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, moves to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 on Senate Bill 590 and requests the formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. And the House does refuse to recede on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 (sic) and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 669. Ebbesen. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 669 and requests formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from Senate...House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 669 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. We're going to the Order of Concurrence. I understand there are some motions to nonconcur...so that we can start the ball rolling for Conference Committees. The House Bills...2427 and 2428. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Spaaer and Members of the House, House Bill 2427 is the Capital Development Board Appropriation Bill and 2428 is the CDB authorization. I move that the House do not concur with Senate Amendments to both of these Bills."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Telcser moves to non-concur on House Bills...on Senate Amendments...all the



Senate Amendments to House Bill 2427. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur to all the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2427. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser moves that the House nonconcur to the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2428. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur to the Senate Amendments on House Bill 2428. 2579. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson does move to nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2579. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 to House Bill 2579. House Bill 2545. Representative Dunn. The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur on House Bill 2545 on Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dunn moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2545. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2545. 1168. House Bill 1168. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines, moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1168. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1168. House Bill 2420. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2420. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The House does nonconcur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2420. House Bill 1986, Representative Reilly. Representative Reilly moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1986. Those in



favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1986. On...on page 9 on the Order of Non-concurrence, Senate Bill 584. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capuzi, moves that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #2 to...House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 584 and requests the formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 584 and a Conference Committee shall be appointed. On page 10, Senate Bill 830. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, moves that the House refuse to recede from a Senate...from House Amendments 1, 2 and 5 to Senate Bill 830, requests a formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from Sen...from House Amendments 1, 2 and 5 to Senate Bill 830 and a Conference Committee shall be appointed. Page 5, on the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 1477. Representative Catania moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 477 (sic). Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1477. On page 8, House Bill 2679. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 and 3 to House Bill 2679. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2679. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "What was that motion?"

Speaker Matjevich: "Do you want to know what Bill that was?"

Getty: "What...yes...what was..."



Speaker Matijevich: "The motion was to nonconcur. Let's see, it was...2679, Representative Mugalian's Bill. All right. The Chair would like to announce again to all the Members, if you have intentions of the formation of a Conference Committee, let us know us here so we either refuse to recede or if we nonconcur ...so that we can set the Conference Committees in motion. We've got to get to this as quickly as possible. So if anybody has the inclination to have the Bill that they are handling in a Conference Committee, you might as well let us know about it. All right. We're now going to go to Appropriation Bills on Concurrence. House Bill 1652. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1652 which is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Rehabilitated Services. What the Amendment does, it makes a total reduction of one hundred and ninty-five thousand dollars in this entire budget. I would move concurrence in...in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1652."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1659 (sic). Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. That's 1652, I'm sorry. This is House Bill 1652. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1652. To the Order of Nonconcurrence. We have Senate Bill 546...where Representative Yourell moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 546 and requests the



formation of a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 546 and a Conference Committee will be created. Representative Yourell. Representative Yourell. Bus Yourell, on page 10 you have two more Bills, 1247 and 1395. Are you refusing on those also? House Bill 2578, on page 8 on the Order of Concurrence. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Health. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. And the total effect in terms of...of dollars is this. The Bill was initially introduced at 95.9 million. The Amendments makes some changes in line items, shifting money to various programs for a total increase of approximately four million dollars ...three and a half million dollars. That money going for...a million and a half for tertiary care for the perinatal program which, I believe, was Representative Darrow's program, 1.2 million for perinatal grants at the...at the secondary level, 4 hundred and forty-four thousand dollars for the staffing of...training... staffing and training grants for perinatal and hospital centers. And I'm sure a lot of you got letters on that. Thirty-three thousand dollars for the PKU Hypothyroidism Follow-up Program and...another hundred and twenty-four thousand dollars for the preparation of a Nuclear Emergency Response. I would move acceptance of Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 2578."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Peters has moved that House do concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,



7 and 8 to House Bill 2578. On that, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment that I was interested in is not on this Bill. What I was interested in was obtaining one hundred thousand dollars for downstate for perinatal clinics. At the present time, the City of Chicago has perinatal clinics under a federally funded program and some state subsidies. We, in downstate, do not have the same clinics. When you ^{think} /of the abortions, when you think of the people who are going in for abortions for a reason that they are unable to afford perinatal clinics, I'm sure you will realize that downstate we must have these funds. We're not talking about a lot of money. We are only talking about a hundred thousand dollars. It's beyond me why the Senate took this Amendment out. The Department of Public Health was in favor of it. We put the Amendment on in the House. I would suggest, therefore, that we do not concur on this Bill, send it back to the Senate and get some money for downstate for the women who are pregnant and cannot afford the proper health care. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich. One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, part of the problem we're having with the appropriations in my estimations..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Peters, why don't you just close because..."

Peters: "Well, No...Mr. Speaker, I might want to agree with Representative Darrow. One of the things that we're finding out that the Senate is just absolutely non-sensical in their dealings with these appropriations. We've got an appropriation of one hundred million



dollars here. We fought in this House for child care money, for child abuse money and for perinatal money. We reformed a nursing care Act, we reformed a child abuse Act and then ^{they}/go around and take out a hundred thousand dollars and don't even have the decency to inform me as the Sponsor of the Bill that they have done that. I've got other information on that. And I don't think that's right for me because my credibility with the Members is at stake and I resent it. And for that reason, I'm going to move to nonconcur."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Peters amends his motion and now moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 2578. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. And the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 2578. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, and may I also suggest this. As Chairman of the Appropriations, Mr. Speaker, you are familiar with the work that the staff and everybody has done."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amen."

Peters: "And we have worked extremely hard on this. And we want to get out of here like everybody wants to get out of here and we have done our work. And I think it's madness on the part of the Senate to put on Amendments, not only on appropriation Bills but on other Members Bills, to tie up the process and ...just to make a madness out of this thing. Now if the Senate is in that kind of a mood, I would suggest to Members on our side of the aisle that we go into a Conference Committee on every Bill...if that's what they want to end up doing. This is crazy action on



their part."

Speaker Matijevich: "Keep your head, Pete. House Bill 2098. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2098 is the appropriation Bill for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. The Senate has added five Amendments, Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and five. And I would move to concur in those Senate Amendments. The basic breakdown is that this budget, if we concur in these Amendments, will pass the House only 1.4 million dollars in General Revenue funds above the amount requested by the Governor, which is the lowest increase that we have ever sent this budget to the Governor's desk in the time that I have handled this appropriation Bill. We will be asking for a total funds of four hundred and seventy-five million dollars...four hundred and seventy-five million, four hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollars for the entire budget for the department. The...there is money is here for those of you who have received letters and phone calls from your community agencies, this budget does include those monies. The 3.7 million that we added here in the House plus another 1...for the developmental disabilities community agencies, plus another million ...a little over a million that was added in the Senate for the mentally ill community agencies. The Department has met with the various groups interested in this appropriations Bill and, as far as I know, everybody seems to be satisfied that their needs have been taken care of either through the funding process or through commitments made to them by the Department for the coming year. And I would ask that we concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kempiners has moved that



the House concur in...with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 on House Bill 2098. There's no discussion. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', 3 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with all Senate Amendments on House Bill 2098. House Bill 1530...one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, an inquiry to the Chair. As I understood, and I have absolutely no problem with the manner in which the Speaker was going, but as I understood you were calling for Bills that will be nonconcurrent in. I think if we're going to go to concurrences and this is a request, we should start from the top down. There are many of us that would like to move the concurrences that we have. But in terms of jumping around, we really don't know where the Chair is going. If we're going to simply move to those Bills that have indicated a nonconcurrence, I have no problem..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes..."

Barnes: "...with it, but if we're going to go to Concurrence ...the last couple of Bills were Concurrence. I think we should start at the top and work straight down through."

Speaker Matijevich: "You have a good point except that we earlier stated that we were going to go on Appropriation Bills on Concurrence and that's ..."

Barnes: "Well, even if we do that, we should start at the top and work straight through. I'm saying it again. There are Bills on the Calendar that have appeared in numerical order prior to the Bills that you are calling. "



Speaker Matijevich: "All right. All right."

Barnes: "That is what I am suggesting. If you're going to do that, start at the top, work straight through. If you're going to go to Bills that are to be nonconcurrent, that's one thing. But if you're going to go to Concurrences, many of us have Bills on the Calendar and you should start at the top and work straight through."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the guest please come to the podium?"
Representative Bluthardt will take the Chair."

Speaker Bluthardt: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It's indeed with a great deal of pleasure...you know, sometimes we start that introduction out that way and it's not really meant that way. But to me, it is with great and sincere pleasure that I introduce a man to you whom I met about forty-three years ago when I left Chicago for the first time in my life. I down to...all the way down to Jacksonville, Illinois to enroll at Illinois college. At that time I met a Gentleman who was then known as Ray Elliot 'Nusspickle' who was the football coach, the baseball coach and the swimming coach at Illinois College. A remarkable man with a remarkable family. He was remarkable in that here at little Illinois College a school without a swimming pool, under the tutelage of Ray Elliot, won four little nineteen swimming championships in a row. He also coached the the baseball team. And my first experience with him in football was one time in my freshman year when I considered myself to be a halfback. He put me in after the score was comfortably one way or the other, and I intercepted a pass down about the five yard line on...fourth down, for a total loss to Illinois College of about twenty yards and the next day I became a guard.



So with little else I would say about it, Ray Elliot has gone on to greater things, is now the Interim Athletic Director at the University of Illinois and I would appreciate it if the Clerk at this time would read, for Ray's benefit and edification of the Membership here, the Resolution honoring him on his appointment as interim coach or Interim Athletic Director of the University of Illinois. I want to do this and I want to say this, I wanted Ray down here for years and I wanted the people of this state, and especially the Representatives, to recognize the fact that the State University of Illinois is at Champaign, Urbana, not in Milwaukee or South Bend, Indiana. Now if you would read the Resolution, please."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 419, sponsored by Bluthardt, Wikoff. Whereas, the legendary Ray Elliot was recently chosen by the Board of Directors of the University of Illinois Athletic Association as Interim Athletic Director. And whereas, Mr. Elliot, former player, coach and associate Athletic Director, was chosen to fill this coveted position. Not only because of his vast knowlege of athletics but because of his great love and dedication to the University of Illinois. And whereas, Mr. Elliot, known for his ability to motivate and inspire, coached football, baseball and swimming at Illinois College in Jacksonville prior to becoming...prior to coming to the University of Illinois as assistant football coach under Bob Zuppke. And whereas, Mr. Elliot, head coach of Illinois during thier Rose Bowl victories in 1947 and 1952 believes that Illinois will once again establish itself as an athletic powerhouse when Illini pride and spirit are restored to the hearts of the university's. athletes and its supporters. And whereas, if this pride and spirit is



passed down to the athletes, as shown in the concern and dedication of Mr. Elliot for the University of Illinois and the University of Illinois will no longer have to settle for the silent sound of defeat but can savor in the thunderous sound of victory. Therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we congratulate the legendary Ray Elliot on being chosen as Interim Athletic Director of the University of Illinois. And be it further resolved, that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to Mr. Elliot as an indication of the deep respect and esteem in which he has held by in the Members of this Body."

Speaker Bluthardt: Thank you. Virg, do want to..."

Wikoff: "I would just ask leave that all Members of the House might be included as Cosponsors of this Resolution."

Speaker Bluthardt: "Now may we hear from the Athletic Director of the University of Illinois, Ray Elliot."

Ray Elliot: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want you to know that I'm very proud and happy to receive this wonderful Resolution. And I assure you it's the high point of my life. I shall always treasure it and keep it close to me. And I'm certainly delighted to be on the podium here with our three folks from Champaign, Urbana, Helen and Tim and Virgil. And you must look at Bluthardt this way. If I could make a football player out of him, I must have been a hell of a coach. That's all. I understand Ladies and Gentlemen that you have invaded Wisconsin and I wish to hell you would invade Michigan and Ohio State and the rest of those places. We've got a lot of guys over there that we need back with us. I think



probably I should give you an idea of what a football coach is about so that you'll all know what we're like. And I guess I can best tell you by a story. Four of us got on a train one day. We got in the compartment. I didn't know the other three people. I reached out my hand and I said, 'I'm Ray Elliot, the football coach of the University of Illinois. I'm married. I've got two sons and they're both lawyers.' And the second guy jumped up and says, 'My name is Bud Wilkinson. I'm from Oklahoma. I'm married and I've got two sons and they're both lawyers. And the third guy jumped up. A stout fellow from down in Ohio State named Woody Hays and he said, 'My name is Woody Hays. I'm the football coach at Ohio State University and I'm married and I've got two sons and they're both lawyers.' And we thought boy that is really something. We talked about that in the middle of the room and finally I looked over at that fourth guy...looked just like you, Sir. I said, 'How about you?' He said, 'I'm a lawyer', he says. 'I'm not married. I've got two sons and they're both football coaches'. So that will give you a little idea of what we're like. Ladies and Gentlemen, I just want you to know one very important thing. When I arrived at the University of Illinois many years ago, there were certain little words that came to my mind that I was taught and brought up with. And I know they're all familiar with you because you are the great ones that give us the great university that we have down there. But I always...brought with me the fact that Illinois loyalty are two great words. We had a song made for it, it's our alma mater song, and we believed in those words, 'great loyalty', to our institution. And then there were words that we learned also, the 'pride' of the Illini. That great song we have also, 'great pride'.



And everytime I think of those words I think of the days that I used to go up and see Ray 'Nitsky' play middle linebacker of the great...up at Green Bay. And you know him well. And everytime I stood before him he would say to me before a game, 'Coach,' he said, 'the biggest thing we've got going for us today is the pride of the Green Bay Packers'. And he looked at me and he would always say, 'That's what I learned down here about great pride.' And there was another name that we learned down there that was very good, a great name that meant a lot to me, is the name of the 'fighting Illini.' It seems an awful lot to us. I know this all sounds corny to you perhaps, but it doesn't to me, believe me. The fighting Illini, we were not named after some animal like the wolverines or the badgers or something. We were named after great men that fought in the grid irons like Red Grange and Buddy Young and Paul 'Fostison' and the wiz kids and all those big guys. And we're going to continue that feeling of getting that warmth back there and have a big happy family in Illinois. And it's going to be done and we're going to win because we're going to get rid of that negative attitude and get the positive attitude that you had when you invaded Wisconsin. Good-bye and God bless you."

Speaker Redmond: "House will be in order. I will take the Appropriation Bills first and get them out of here if we can and then I'll go back and take it in sequence. And woe betide anybody who isn't on the floor. What we've been trying to do is take the Bills where the Members were here. What's the next one? How about 1288, Representative Taylor? Okay, out of the record. 1351, Schneider. Representative Schneider."



Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, 1351 is the appropriation for the companion Bill 1350 which passed out of here overwhelmingly recently. What it requires is that...school districts have been asking for I.O.E. and the School Problems Commission to provide services for determining efficiency in transportation. What this does is appropriate the money. It was reduced in Committee by over fifty thousand dollars...to one hundred and ninety-six thousand. I would solicit an 'aye' vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? What is the motion, to concur?"

Schneider: "To concur, right."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentlemen's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1351. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and 10 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1351. 1635, McAuliffe. 1635. Oh, okay. 1635. Okay, we'll take the last Roll Call on 1351. 1351. 1351. The question is on the Gentleman's motion that House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1351. Representative Garmisa, are you...those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'aye' and 21 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to 1351. Well now I have call them. It's all up on 1635 and then I'll be back to you, McClain. 1635, McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1635."



Speaker Redmond: "Any...any questions, any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1635. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1635. 1531. Representative McClain, 1531."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill that I had to hold on yesterday but problems have been worked out. I'd like to concur and ask you to concur with Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 1531. What they did was they reduced the appropriation for the State Appellate Defender by ninety-seven thousand dollars, ninety thousand dollars in personal services, seven thousand dollars in travel. I should inform the Membership that they believe the seven thousand dollars in travel is too expensive. They will most probably come back here in the fall or in the spring for a supplemental to help them out on travel. But in lieu of the actions on behalf of the Senate and how the Senate Appropriation Committee has acted, they've asked me to concur with Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 1531."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1531. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 15 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to 1531. 1635, Ralph Dunn. Out of the record."



1647, Representative Ryan. Out of the record. 1653, Representative J.J. Wolf. 1653, J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Amendment #2 reduces contractual services in the Senior Citizens Action Division by three thousand dollars. This is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Lieutenant Governor's office. And I would ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1653. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 4 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1653. 1656. Would you clear the board, Mr. Clerk? Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 172...it's not a question. Representative Macdonald. 1656."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to the appropriation for the Environmental Protection Agency. Senate Amendment #1 reduced one hundred and sixty-three thousand, three hundred and fifty dollars for the General Revenue Fund and five hundred and thirty-three thousand, five hundred and forty-five in federal funds for a total of six hundred and ninety-six thousand, eight hundred and ninety-five dollars. Amendment #2 reduced the anti-pollution bond funds reappropriation by eighteen million, three hundred and three..one hundred and ninety-six thousand dollars. Amendment #3 added one hundred and ninety thousand dollars back to the General Revenue Fund



to provide the state's share of the three planning Commissions in Northern Illinois, Southwestern, Greater Egypt Match to receive Federal Water Pollution Control Sections under 208 funds. Amendment #4 did restore one hundred and thirty thousand, eight hundred and twenty-five in federal funds to the Water and Land Pollution Control Divisions to reduce the vacancy phase-in rate to accommodate the current head count. Amendment #5 added twelve thousand...twelve million, seven hundred and seventy to the Anti-Pollution Bond Fund. The Environmental Protection Agency accepts these Amendments and I would urge your acceptance of them also."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 1656. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.^{Final action.} Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 24 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 1656. 1647, Representative Ryan. 1647, Representative Ryan. It's 1647, Mr. Clerk."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. Senate Amendment #1 adds five hundred and forty-three thousand dollars to the Governor's Office of Interagency Cooperation. That money was originally contained in the GOMED's budget Bill. And along with an extra thousand dollars for travel in the Executive Mansion for a total of five hundred forty-four thousand dollars. Senate Amendment #2 adds thirty-four thousand, one hundred dollars to the Executive Mansion for three new employees. And Senate Amendment #3 adds twenty-nine thousand dollars



in personal services which is a result of Senate Amendment #1 in the...GOMED agency transfer. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's...Representative Pullen. Representative Campbell, please sit down. Representative Pullen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Pullen: "I hope this is a friendly question for the record. Is there any money in here for International Year of the Child?"

Ryan: "No."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Who are the three new employees? What is that for?"

Ryan: "Three new employees. It's at the Executive Mansion. I don't know who they are."

Johnson: "What are they going to do?"

Ryan: "They're going to work at the Mansion."

Johnson: "Well, are they going to be a butler or what are they..."

Ryan: "Just service personnel at the Mansion."

Johnson: "That's what I mean, what kind? What do they do? Why do they need three extras?"

Ryan: "To keep the Mansion up, I suppose, to maintain the service there. It's pretty obvious. Did you want to put your application in?"

Johnson: "I might if we work here much longer...or something."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's...Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Hanahan: "Representative Ryan, I noticed with interest that the Office of Interagency Cooperation was initiated in



1978 in order to provide a centralized location where consumer assistance and information could be obtained for problems relating to the state. Now this I'm reading as part of the purpose. The Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development, known as GOMED, originally anticipated filling five advocate positions. And those advocate positions were Hispanic, ethnic, women, children and consumers. Could you tell me how many are filled at the present time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Is that in...which agency are talking about? Are you talking about the Interagency Cooperation office?"

Hanahan: "Yes, the GOMED portion of it."

Ryan: "Well I don't know if that's germane..."

Hanahan: "It's an appropriation. You're asking for money."

Ryan: "Yeah, but let me explain. We're taking the agency ...the money was originally in the GOMED Bill. We're taking that money out for the Interagency Cooperation."

Hanahan: "Right. You're taking that money out."

Ryan: "Out of the...out of the...no. It was originally contained in the GOMED Bill, that's right."

Hanahan: "Right. And the money is in this Bill."

Ryan: "That's right."

Hanahan: Okay, and I asked the question...that the positions of the advocates for the Hispanic, ethnic, women, children and consumer are part of this Bill as you are presenting it here for concurrence. I am asking the question, how many of these advocate positions are now filled of these five positions?"

Ryan: "Do you want it broken down by positions?"

Hanahan: "Well there's only five. Hispanic, is that filled?"

Ryan: "One second. They've all been filled."

Hanahan: "Well, according to my information, only two of them have been filled and that is the consumer and the women's position. I was wondering how long ago



did the Hispanic...and who is the advocate on the Hispanic for the Governor's office right now?"

Ryan: "We don't...we don't have a listing, Representative, for the Hispanic advocate. Maybe you've got the wrong title for it."

Hanahan: "I'm right. Wait a second. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a very important interagency. And I have no quarrel with Representative Ryan and he's got enough short stops around him there to get these answers for him. Now the facts are that only two of these positions are filled, three are vacant, have been vacant and I don't know if they'll ever be filled. And before I vote for a concurrence on this kind of Bill, we should have that kind of information. And I'll give you another question..."

Ryan: "I'll be glad to get you the information..."

Hanahan: "Yeah, all right. And I have another question for you then."

Ryan: "Tell me which three are vacant and I'll...you know, let's not leave this. My impression is that they are filled. Now I want to know what three offices you're telling me are vacant ."

Hanahan: "I'm saying the office on Hispanic is vacant."

Ryan: "All right, what's the other one."

Hanahan: "The office on children are vacant."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not getting the right answers here. There's a little confusion on this. I'll take the Bill out of the record until..."

Hanahan: "No...wait...don't take it out of the record. I've got another question for the general..."

Ryan: "All right, we'll get the answers for you somehow."

Hanahan: "Okay, here's the other question. You have fiscal year request of five hundred and forty-nine thousand, four hundred dollars for this appropriation for this off...for these positions of the Office of Interagency



Cooperation for the GOMED positions. In 1978, this total appropriation was one hundred and six thousand. We're talking about a 500% increase when not a damn thing has been done. And I'd like the answers right now. When you get the time, have your shortstops pick them up from the Governor. What in the hell is he going to do with another half a million dollars when he hasn't done anything in the last two years...when he jumped...he's asking for an increase from two hundred thousand to five hundred and forty-nine thousand to take care of the advocacy's position on children, on ethnics, on Hispanics, on women and all the other myriad problems that our society has concerning advocacy problems and...and he's got the gall to ask for an increase like this and give you no information. I think...it's no reflection on you."

Ryan: "Well I've got the information..."

Hanahan: "I think the Governor should come up here and give them the information."

Ryan: "We'll get the information to you and we'll take it out of the record until you've got it."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1657, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, please take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1682, Representative Leverenz. Leverenz, 1682. Representative Katz. Representative Katz, don't disturb Representative Leverenz. Representative Mautino, will you tell Representative Lev...that isn't Katz, is it? It looked like Katz. 1682, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "You finally got my attention, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. House Bill 1652 (sic) on concurrence..."

Speaker Redmond: "82."

Leverenz: "82, sorry. I'll get my attention together yet."



Speaker Redmond: "And that fellow will sell you anything."

Leverenz: "Maybe I sold him something. I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 3. Senate Amendment #1 makes a reduction of nineteen thousand dollars in personal services. Senate Amendment #2 increases Telecommunications two thousand. Senate Amendment #3 restores seven thousand dollars in personal services. They are minor changes. I would ask for concurrence on Senate Amendments to House Bill 1682."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Leverenz, are are you yielding?"

Leverenz: "I certain am."

Totten: "Representative, how much of an increase..."

Leverenz: "Who's got my attention?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Leverenz: "Go ahead, General...Governor."

Totten: "Representative Totten, how much of an..."

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

Matijevec: "Well, Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege. Very often on this floor I hear many rise and say that on a Bill while it's being considered we should chase off the agencies of government who are lobbying on a Bill. I happen to know that right now in one of our downstate Democratic Leader's offices the Department of Transportation is lobbying, making promises in support of the Governor's Thompson-Jane Brynes #2 Proposal. I think that's in violation of the spirit of the rules of the House. That when we're considering a major issue, that we not be lobbied



on it and twisted on it by fake promises. And I think think it's about time that Jerry Bradley clears his office and get on the floor where he belongs."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think he ought to tell us what room they're in, I haven't got my deal cut yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Totten. Let's get together here."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, before I was interrupted by the deal making, I asked Representative Leverenz how much of an increase this was for the Legislative Council over last year's budget?"

Leverenz: "Less than 3% as originally proposed. As it is now it would be further reduced by approximately ten thousand dollars."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1682. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130...142 'aye' and 5 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1682. 1916, E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But...I believe 1902..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll get back to 1902."

Barnes: "All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment makes the following changes. The 7% solution that's being offered in the Senate, 12.2 decrease. It phases in one attorney budgeted for nine months at a 4.3 decrease. The retirement decreased 2...twenty-three hundred, contractual two thousand and and that's a



greater service...fifty thousand. The total GRF decrease is forty-seven thousand, three hundred. The total...total state's attorney assistant decrease is twenty-three thousand, five hundred. For a total reduction of seventy thousand, eight hundred. I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment 2 and 3 to House Bill 1916."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1916. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 10 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1916. 1902, Representative Barnes. Representative Breslin."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr..."

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

Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker and Members. I have a conflict of interest in this last Bill that just passed, House Bill 1916, and thus I'm recorded as not voting. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1902."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Amendment 1 to 1902. The Amendment makes the word 'tuition' from the Bill that occurs in 1902 and...in search and in lieu thereof to provide for dental grants. I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1902."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1902."



Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 7 'no'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1902. 2004, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with all of the Senate Amendments on House Bill 2004. These...this Bill is the Commission's Bill. What we intend to do to pass 2004 in its present form...and if there any adjustments that have to be made, we're doing it with Senate Bill 157. So I therefore now move to concur on all of the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matijevich: "Yes, Sir."

Totten: "This is one of the Christmas Tree Bills and I wonder if you would tell us the Senate Amendments...what they are what we are concurring in?"

Matijevich: "Well, the Senate Amendment #1 took out various monies and, in fact, a sum totally...on various Commissions it was a total reduction of four hundred and twenty-one thousand, four hundred and fifty-two dollars. In the Amendments thereafter, the sum that they took out of Senate Amendment #1 were then put back in. And what happened was that the Chairman of the Subcommittee on this...in the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, on those were...the Chairmen of the various Commissions didn't show, he just took them out. But then they were put back in in four Amendments later. Senate Amendment #2 is thirty-five thousand for the Ethnic Heritage Commission. #3, a



hundred and fifty thousand for the Vehicle Recycling Board. #4, one hundred thousand for a study to develop alternative energy sources. #5, is no dollar change...lump sum...nonpersonal services range..."

Totten: "Got an International Year of the Child in there?"

Matijevich: "What's that?"

Totten: "Sorry, go ahead."

Matijevich: "#6, that's on the status of women but there's no dollar change. #6 is three ^{hundred} thousand to GOMED for the displaced homemaker. #7, fourteen thousand to...for the Year of the Child, DCFS. Senate Amendment 8 failed. #9, ten thousand for the model school for the Deaf Commission. #10, forty thousand to the Council on Health and Physical Fitness. #11, ninety thousand increase in the appropriation to the Council on Nutrition. #12 failed. #13, a hundred and thirty-seven thousand, nine twenty to the Criminal Sentencing Commission. #14, the same amount to the Department of Corrections for the Criminal Sentencing Commission. Senate Bill 15 (sic), twenty-five thousand to the Supreme Court for payment of court appointed counsel guardians ad litem and experts. Senate Amendment 16, one hundred fifty-six thousand, five hundred to EPA for preparation of an air quality demonstration in Madison and St. Clair Counties. That should be..."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Totten."

Totten: "There are a number of Amendment which are purely corrections or additions or deletions but there are some that are quite controversial and are Amendments that were debated in this House and defeated before. And I would like ask to divide the question on some of these. And if you'll just me give a second...I'd like to divide the question on 2...3 I think we've already done someplace else, haven't we, John?"



Matijevich: "Senate Amendment #3. That may be now in Senate Bill 157."

Totten: "I think it is."

Matijevich: "Except that that's on Third Reading now..."

Totten: "Well I'd like to pull that off here seeing we've got it someplace else."

Matijevich: "Why don't you pull it off there?"

Totten: "I'd like to...be where we are right now because I've got a better chance. So I would like to divide the question on 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 13 is one we've defeated before, 14 and 16."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you mean these are the controversial ones, is that correct? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I would plead with the Gentleman that we either concur or maybe we could try...I'd rather nonconcur and see what the Senate does and see how they persist in these various motions...or these Amendments. If the Senate refuses to recede, I think that's a pretty good indication from this House that that's the way it's going to be. And I'd rather not take the time of the House on these matters of division when I find as I've traveled through this legislative process year after year that this is the way they're all going to end up anyhow. So rather than that, I going to move to nonconcur with all Senate Amendments and then let's see what the Senate does. I'd rather do it the way I was proceeding, but I'll just move to nonconcur with all Senate Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yeah, I just have a question I'd like to ask. Do we still have fifty thousand dollars in here for Representative Marovitz's summer vacation in Europe. to study Hospices?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "You want the...where the Hospices Commission is?"



Skinner: "Yes."

Matijevich: "It's in Senate Bill 157."

Skinner: "Oh, I hope you'll remind me when it comes back.
Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Matijevich: "My mind is not on transportation, I'll try."

Speaker Redmond: "Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, you know, it's interesting to listen to Representative Totten and Representative Skinner wanting to divide the question, taking up more time of the House, more time in enrolling and engrossing, more time on the tapes upstairs, more time in paperwork and neither one of them saw fit to vote for the expenses of maintaining and running this House and keeping this House in an orderly manner. Representative Skinner and Totten both in their glory refused to vote to pay for the expenses of this House. I thought the Members would like to know that."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Matijevich's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16. Those in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcur in the Senate Amendments. Representative Skinner, personal privilege."

Skinner: "Yes, I would trust the Gentleman from Winnebago would learn eventually not to mention other people's names in debate if he doesn't want to get a rebuttal. He may remember that the reason I voted against it is because the employees of the House are not paid at the same level of pay as are the employees in the Senate. I personally think the employees in the House are superior to the employees of the Senate and I don't think they should be paid less. My vote was



strictly a protest vote, Sir. It didn't stop the extra money..."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 2425, Representative Ryan.

Representative Mulcahey, please sit down. Representative Hallock, please sit down. 2425."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2425 is the OCE for the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Senate Amendment #1 transfers five hundred and fifty-nine thousand, five hundred dollars from personal services, retirement and social security into contractual services. And I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question...Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "The first Commission you mentioned, the guardianship and Advocacy, what is the size of that appropriation?"

Ryan: "...million, seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

Leinenweber: "What?"

Ryan: "One million, seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars."

Leinenweber: "And what does the Amendment do?"

Ryan: "Okay, it transfers five hundred and fifty-nine thousand five hundred dollars from personal services, retirement and social security to contractual services."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Ryan: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2425. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113 'aye', 29 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2425."



2426, Representative Telcser. Representative Ryan, will you please sit down?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 242..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock, please sit down."

Telcser: "House Bill 2426 is the Capital Development Board reappropriation Bill. The Senate adopted Amendments, #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Senate Amendment #1 deletes three projects. Senate Amendment #2 adds some language to the Community College of East St. Louis' Skilled Training Center...a line item to indicate that what they're talking about are durable, movable equipment items with no increase in funding. Senate Amendment #3 reduces the reappropriation level by thirty-three million, seventy-four thousand, six hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars which is the amount of money currently available. Senate Amendment #4 deletes fifty-five thousand dollars for street lights and pedestrian improvements in a Chicago circle campus area. Senate Amendment #5 deletes one hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars for remodeling and rehabilitation of properties at 630 South College Avenue. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2426."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2426. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 22 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2426. 2486, Representative Friedrich. Representative Friedrich, 2486. Who's the Vice-Chairman of the



Reference Bureau? Who? Representative Skinner, the biggest stockholder? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate Amendment reduced the appropriation by twenty-one thousand, three hundred dollars. I don't think they should have. We're going to run out of money. If they run out of money, they'll run out of Bills and Amendments, and maybe that's good. We don't have enough money to attract and keep the kind of help we would like to have. But nevertheless, I move we concur in the Senate Amendment and if we run out of money we'll back for a deficiency."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2486. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2486. 2574, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2574. This is the ordinary and contingent expense budget for the Department of Registration and Education. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the budget by one hundred seventy-one thousand, three hundred dollars for purposes of the 7% solution. It also transfers some expenses which are actually general office expenses from the Registration Division line item to the general office. Senate Amendment #2 restores three hundred twenty-three thousand, two hundred dollars in the Electronic Data Processing Division, Examining Committees, Real Estate Enforcement Registration and the Medical Disciplinary Board. Amendment #3 transfers five thousand dollars in the Registration Division from Printing to Telecommunications and makes no dollar



change. Amendment #4 adds thirteen thousand, seven hundred dollars to the Real Estate Division to restore one new licensing specialist, requested in the fiscal 80 budget and cut by the House. The budget totals seven million, two hundred and seven thousand if these Amendments are concurred in. The budget originally came in at seven million, seven hundred and three thousand, seven hundred dollars. So it would be a reduction of five hundred twenty-three thousand, seven hundred under what the budget was originally proposed at. I think this is...both House and Senate Appropriations Committees have done a very responsible job in cutting this budget and I would move to concur in the Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Darrow: "Representative Pullen, are funds in this Bill to provide adequate testing facilities for the downstate nursing students that were deleted earlier?"

Pullen: "Yes that's in Senate Amendment #2."

Darrow: "So we'll have no problem with our nurses?"

Pullen: "I would not anticipate there would be one. We've tried to provide for that."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yes, will the Lady yield? Can she inform us... is she going to vote for the Bill this time?"

Pullen: "Yes."

Kempiners: "Fine, I think it's a good Bill and I'm going to vote for it too."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 in House Bill 2574. Those in



favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 23 'no'. And the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 in House Bill 2574. 2575. 2575, Representative Conti. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess one of my downstate Leaders thought I wasn't serious a little while ago when I said that I knew that he was in the back room cutting a deal, probably for himself. I'm sure that he's not interested in all of the Members of the General Assembly. And what bothers me about it, I thought he was working with some of us who were interested in all of the Members. And I said that I thought that...that downstate Leader ought to be on the Floor, here leading his troops. And I thought that what comes over the Floor would ring into his office and he'd know that one of the Members who feels very strongly about this...that he'd come marching out on the Floor and do his job. But I guess he thought I was kidding. Well I'm not kidding. And we just have a day left in this Session and I have been known around the Floor of the House do a lot of things around here...that if people don't listen, that I do all that I can do draw those who feel as strongly as I do to make the point loud and clear. Now this transportation package is coming to a head. And there's a lot of us on this Floor, in all sections of the State of Illinois, that feel very strongly about it...that any one area of the State of Illinois shouldn't be ripped off and not to set one area of the State of Illinois against the other area of the State of Illinois. We just feel strongly about that. Some feel so strongly they said we should pick certain



appropriation Bills. One of them that would hurt some people that I've worked with through all of my Sessions in the Legislature, and I don't want to do that. But I'll do anything to get all of the Members of this House to sit down, to let both the Governor and the Mayor of the City of Chicago to know that this is one State of Illinois. Like Ray Elliot said, 'One State of Illinois'. And we've got to work on a compromise that hurts not one area of the State of Illinois. And I think that Jerry Bradley as a downstate Leader is committed to that, or he should be, and the best way to make that commitment is to get over in his seat and work at it. And we'll be here on the Floor to help him work at it, not his back office with a DOT official that can make those promises like they did in Dolly Hallstrom's district a little while ago when they dedesignated the north leg and those promises aren't forthcoming and they're going to make the same promises again. The same promises that as a Chicago Tribune Editorial said, nobody can make, because we don't even know, we don't even know if that dedesignation is legal until Congress acts on it. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Floor, in all areas of the State of Illinois let's not cut a deal that nobody knows...can^{be} even be cut. So I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you use the force of your gavel as the best Leader we've got in the Democratic Party, our Speaker, and who...you speak for all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to cut that deal out right now that's going on in that back office."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Matijevich made some pretty good points. But I'd to help prevent him from getting



an ulcer by just reminding him that we have seen a lot of versions of the Byrne-Thompson Proposal and each one keeps getting worse and worse. Now a good deal is a deal that has something for everybody. Well right now they're at the point where there's nothing for anybody. Chicago gets ripped off, Chicago suburbs get ripped off, the collar counties and downstate too. Everytime we see a new proposal distributed here to our desks, there's a little less in it for everybody. So I don't...I don't think you have to worry, Representative Matijevich, about Jerry Bradley getting too much, there's nothing left in the cookie jar anymore."

Speaker Redmond: "2575, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2575 is the Appropriation Bill for the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1, 2, 4 and 5. Senate Amendment #1 makes a total reduction of one hundred and forty-nine thousand, eight hundred and ninety-five dollars to provide for the 7% pay plan reduction. It reduces travel and equipment line items and provide for a separate line item for statistical and tabulation services. Senate Amendment #2 makes a three hundred thousand dollar reduction to change the amount of the initial operating funds for the banks and trust companies funds from seven hundred and fifty thousand to four hundred and fifty thousand. Senate Amendment #4 restores a total of thirty-two thousand, six hundred and forty dollars for the General Revenue Fund to provide nine month funding for one vacancy taken out by Amendment #1, restores twenty thousand dollars for travel and adds back six thousand dollars for the replacement of an automobile. Senate Bill #5 adds one hundred and ten thousand dollars



to the General Revenue Fund to provide for administration of the Electronic Fund Transferring Transmission Facility Act in Senate Bill 906. The total appropriation originally was three million, ninety-nine thousand. The House Bills brought it up to four million, twelve thousand. Now the Senate Bills reduce it to three million, seven hundred and five thousand dollars, a net reduction of three hundred and seven thousand dollars. And I move for the concurrence of the Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Representative Conti, would explain Amendment #4 again. That's what, thirty-three thousand...what was that?"

Conti: "Restores a total of thirty-two thousand, six hundred and forty dollars to provide a nine month funding for one vacancy taken out of by Amendment #1. It restores twenty thousand dollars for travel and adds back six thousand dollars for replacement of an automobile. Now that travel is within the state, from one bank to another, that doesn't mean going to Europe."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2575. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye' and 7 'no'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2575. 2577, Reich Marshal Polk. Out. Let's see now, are we ready on...Representative Hanahan and you, Representative Ryan? Have a meeting of the minds on 1647. Okay. Senate Bills, Third Reading on page 2, Senate Bill 157,



Representative E.M. Barnes. E.M. Barnes, is he in the Chamber? Out of the record. 483, Representative Winchester. Winchester, 483. Senate Bills, Third Reading."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and contingent appropriation for the Department of Administrative Services. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question...or you haven't read the Bill. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 483. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Administrative Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 578 is next. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 578. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 578. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, I move the adoption of House...Senate Bill 578. There were a number of Amendments put on. As you all know, one of them is the Department of Public Aid. And I ask for your favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this...shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 22 'no'."



The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 580, Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 580 is the Appropriation Bill for the Department of Revenue. The total request for this year is in the neighborhood of four hundred million dollars, three hundred ninety-six million. This is approximately a three percent increase over the budget for last year. And I ask for your approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 580. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 8 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 587, Representative Bower. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 587. A Bill for an Act making the ordinary and contingent expenses appropriation for the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Governor's Office of Manpower. One hundred and fourteen million, two hundred and seventy-four thousand, one hundred dollars. I urge your adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed



vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye' and 20 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 588. Davis on the floor? Representative Davis, you had better get over to your chair."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 588. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the expenses of the Department of Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis. Representative Katz, leave him alone."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you'll give me a minute so I can find my stuff."

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe Representative Katz has it."

Davis: "It's totally possible he has everything else. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 588 is the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Law Enforcement. This year, prior to Amendment...House Amendment #4, the FA 80 request was eighty million dollars, eight hundred and twenty-four thousand. The appropriation for 79 was seventy-two million, six hundred and eighty-seven thousand. The requested increase was 11.19%. The Senate made substantial cuts in this appropriation. The House rearranged some dollars and added in some personnel dollars, took out some equipment dollars. House Amendment #4 added in 2.2 million dollars for a pay raise for the State Troopers only, not for all sworn personnel, over my objection I might add. And now the new Bill total is eighty-three million dollars, eleven thousand for a total increase approximately 13% in the law enforcement budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

Davis: "Over the Governor's objection."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'aye' and 0 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 891. Now, Representative Katz, you can see Representative Davis. 891, Representative Ryan."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 891. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the expenses of the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. Do you know if there is an Amendment filed to that...another Amendment filed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there an Amendment?"

Ryan: "Then I would ask for leave to take it back to Second Reading for that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return 891 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #65, amends Senate Bill 891 as amended on page 20 by inserting between lines nine and ten the following. Neff, McMasters, McGrew,"

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment? Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment was considered last night. And through some confusion I don't believe the...many of the Legislators realize how important this is. This is for a road between Monmouth and Macomb. We have no four-lane roads in that section of the country at all. We're not asking for an interstate road, we're asking two more lanes to be added. And any of you that have been to Western University or traveled that road know the...what a



heavy traffic it carries. The students, 70% of them, come out of northern Chicago and the northern part of Illinois. And these students going back and forth...and many of you folks have had children or driven down to Western and you know what I'm talking about. But we're not asking for this road to be completed now, we're asking for some engineering work to be done on it and to purchase the right away and so forth...and that's what will be needed. And I certainly would be glad to answer any questions and would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 65. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Wait a minute. Pardon me, pardon. There's a motion to table the Amendment. Who's the maker of that motion? Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a motion to table Amendment 21 on House Bill 891. I can appreciate the concern of the Sponsor of this Amendment but I think the approach is disastrous. It completely eliminates a technical office for Phase II of a two billion dollar railroad relocation program that consists...that vitally concerns twelve communities and two states. This project is located in the city of East St. Louis. And it was located there to show the committment of the State of Illinois, the Federal Government and State of Missouri their determination and their intent to revitalize the city of East St. Louis. If we're truly interested in creating hundreds of jobs for the



people in East St. Louis, if we're truly interested in developing the River Front, if we're truly interested in the economic growth of that city, it's absolutely imperative that this motion be supported. Without this two hundred and fifty thousand dollars the entire project office will be eliminated. Two billion dollars of money, Federal money, railroad money and state money will be jeopardized. And I ask support of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this motion. The most important thing that's come down the pike for East St. Louis since its decay has been idea of relocating all of the railroads. The railroads continually block the streets. They are inefficient. Not only that, but that the actual cost of spending two billion dollars for the job of relocating will create a lot of work itself. If East St. Louis is ever going to be turned around, anytime in the future, number one project is relocating the railroad tracks. Now I don't know how true it is, but I heard an accusation on the floor last night that the reason that the Amendment was put in to start with, to take the money out for the office of relocating the railroad, was simply because the Sponsor wanted three jobs. Well I'm not accusing the Sponsor of doing that, but let me tell you, if that's the way to operate, then I'm in that district, I want three. And Cissy Stiehl is in that district and maybe she wants three. And Kenny Hall is in that district, maybe he wants three. Let's put twelve people in there that don't do any work. Now I say that this is very important to East St. Louis and I cannot understand the Sponsor of the Amendment continually getting up here and supporting



East St. Louis for this and that, industrial parts, and come along and try to shoot them down for the most important thing that ever happened to them. So I say, let's approve this motion to...on that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Just so that we all know what we're doing here, Representative Neff moved the adoption of Amendment #65 and that carried. And Representative Stiehl moved to table Amendment #21, am I correct on that? And we're on Representative Neff...Stiehl's motion to table Amendment #21. Representative Younge. Representative Younge."

Younge: "...Speaker, I ask that the Members of this Body vote 'no' on Representative Stiehl's motion to table my motion to take^{out} these funds in this project. The Department of Transportation has acted very irresponsibly so far as this whole project is concerned. The Morning Globe talks about ten contracts that are...that have been illegally entered into in reference to this project and the whole matter should be investigated. The appropriation's process discovered that the Louis Hill Contract had been illegally entered into. He was paid five thousand dollars to attend two meetings in St. Louis, Missouri. Five thousand dollars for a meeting, a ten thousand dollar contract. There is another man, a Jack 'Kirkland' in St. Louis, Missouri, was paid fifteen thousand dollars to come over and consult and advise on social issues. The record is rampant. From one contract after another, it shows that the local office is a sham and a fraud and the whole appropriations process has been avoided and denied. I made a reasonable effort to negotiate and try to save this office and this process and this project but I cannot recommend it to you. I cannot recommend any project in which there is an office located in a town in which the officials of that office



say and admit they have systematically violated every equal opportunity policy of the State of Illinois. I sat in a meeting yesterday morning and heard the contract...the project director and manager say, yes he did a utilization study and that study showed that there were high people of high unemployment there and there were people willing and able and qualified to work but the...the past director of this project hand picked persons from all over the country, persons from New York and Washington and Orlando, Florida. The record even shows he hired his friend from Orlando, Florida. The record shows that he hired Louis Hill from Chicago. And I say that this matter ought to go to an Audit Commission and it ought to be fully investigated. I made an effort to...to put together a reasonable agreement so that the project will go on but this is a sham of the appropriations process of the General Assembly. It is a sham upon the use of Federal funds. And until these matters are straightened out, I do not believe that you ought to fund the office. I even got a letter from the Department of Transportation this morning, after they had agreed to try to straighten out some of the problems, saying that even the original amount that they put in the budget for two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, they did not need. That they did not need this money. And I have that letter and I've shown that letter to Chairman Matijevich. On their own admission, they do not...need that money. And I think that because of the fraud, because of the violation of the economic and EEO policies of the State of Illinois and the handling of these things, you should table the funds. And that is my request and I ask you to vote 'no' against Representative Stiehl's motion to table my Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Wyvetter Young's motion that you vote 'no' against Cissy Stiehl's...Representative Stiehl's tabling motion. I've served my second Session as Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee and that meeting where Representative Stiehl's made some very cogent remarks relative to the relocation contract, I said, 'Representative Stiehl...Representative Wyvetter Younge, you do the best job you have ever done.' And, believe me, she did such a good job that a Republican Member of that Committee commended her for it. Now, she has pointed out the questions of the Auditor General in relation to these contracts. She also pointed out to you that there were no local people used in these contracts. And DOT at this late date, much like the bureaucracy does, right at this late date they try to throw a little bone to her and ...to get some votes for this and that. And Wyvetter Younge said, 'No, I think the whole thing is rotten, that it does need investigation'. And I think we, as a Legislative Body, with all of the evidence that we had in our Committee, that all of the evidence that a article in the Globe Democrat has surely demonstrated to me and many others, that an investigation ought to be instituted...and that we should support her. She was very intense about this issue. There's one thing that all of us must admit'...because some have/criticized ^{half-heartedly} that Wyvetter Younge has introduced in this Legislature so many things that are what she thinks important to her district. But she works day and night on those projects and she is intense about it because of the low employment in her area. And all I can do is applaud her for it. We all know that many of those projects she's worked for won't come to fruition but I



wish that all of us could work as hard as she does to do what you think is important for your district. And this is important to her. It's important that ...as she said, that they use local people. But most importantly, the...the Department, right at the last minute, has admitted that their budget to us was phony. They admit it and I've got the letter before me. So the best way for us to and say that we, as a Legislative Body, agree that 'it was phony...is to support Wyvetter Younge and we can do that now by voting 'no' against Representative Stiehl's motion to table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Stiehl and Representative Monroe Flinn in their motion to table this Amendment. I'm probably one of the few Members who has taken the time to go down to inspect this project, to go over the plans and to go over the plans in the DOT headquarters here and, in deed, to fly over the project in a helicopter with Representative Ev Steele and some officials from DOT. This project is not an East St. Louis project, though in deed, it is the one project that I have seen that may have some real long term economic impact there. It is a statewide project. The plans for that area, if brought to fruition, would make a major impact on the whole southern part of this state from Springfield on south. They are talking about major economic developments with corporations from all across the country. And I would assume that that kind of massive, complicated railroad relocation would in part explain why they may not have used local people exclusively in developing the contract. It would be a tragedy for this state economically and in every other way if



we were to allow what seems to be in part, and I understand the necessity of such things, a local, political dispute. And I do not demean it in any way by saying that, I'm just saying that seems to be partly what's involved. It would be a tragedy for the whole state if we lost the whole project. If there are things wrong with the contracts, there are other ways to get at that without gutting the whole program. This Amendment, if you do not table it, ends the program, period, full stop, end of sentence. So you must, I think, support Representative Monroe Flinn and Representative Stiehl in their motion to table this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had the privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee the two days that this was discussed. And I know the concern of the Sponsor of the Amendment, but I really think that she has succeeded in capturing the attention of the Department of Transportation as was exhibited quite amply last evening. I think at this point we had better consider what the result will be and what the impact will be on the people that this will affect. Don't sacrifice the people that this project is meant to help for the sake of a little political problem. Two of the Members of this House from that district are asking you to restore these funds and I would also ask you to restore these funds. I support the motion. This is an important project and it's right in the middle of things. We ought to be continuing this project now and ^{that} means, please, support this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Totten."

Totten: "I was just going to move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's put the record straight. It's true that there were some articles printed questioning the manner of handling some of the contracts with the state. But the Auditor General also said that this is common practice in thousands of contracts...are handled this way. So let's not single out one project, one major program that is the only means of revitalizing the economy of East St. Louis and say cancel the whole thing. Let's tell the state to get their House in order and not to do it again. And then what about the budget. I have a copy of the letter, too. And what it says is they vitally need this two hundred and fifty thousand but they do not need the extra one hundred and thirty thousand dollars that Representative Young would like to hire three people. I have talked to the head of this project. They have assured me that they are going to give consideration to Representative Young and to all of the people in East St. Louis and in all of the surrounding communities. And they are represented on every neighborhood council, every steering committee, every advisory council and there will be hearings held in her community. This is the important to the entire southern Illinois area. It is important to the entire midwestern area, to the city of St. Louis and to St. Louis County. And please don't jeopardize it just because somebody wants three jobs. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion that Amendment #21 be tabled. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Young."



Younge: "I want to vote 'no' on this motion to table my motion to take out of these funds because the whole handling of this project has been against and adverse to the...to the laws to the State of Illinois. It is important to the people of the State of Illinois that the people in each town be treated fairly. And we have an obligation to make^{sure} that people in southern Illinois and East St. Louis are treated fairly in this regard as in every other regard."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we've still got a day to go in this Session. I rise in support of Wyvetter Younge's motion. I rise to support her because I know Wyvetter Younge does a good job for East St. Louis. I know that she would not do anything to hurt her constituency down there. When you talk about an agreement being made, if that is so, so be it. Agreements are made on this Floor every day of the week because I've been here for eleven years. It's a good Amendment...to Senate Bill 891. I'm supporting Wyvetter and I would hope that more of my Democratic friends supported Wyvetter Younge and her motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the motion to table this Amendment. I would point out to the Members of this House that the Amendment was put on in Committee. And while I am not all together familiar with the details of this controversy, I was more than a little perplexed to listen to Representative Stiehl refer to the community that Representative Younge represents as her community. Well it seems to me, Representative Stiehl, that you and Mrs. Younge represent the same



community. And that being the case, intencine fights like this one should have been resolved before it got to Committee and before it got to the Floor of this House. Now the Committee chose to put this Amendment on and it seems to me...unfair and illogical that you would come to this House and ask us to take something off that you could not defeat in the first instance. I urge, therefore, a 'no' vote on this motion to table this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, like Representative Braun, am not too familiar with the project but I am familiar with the personalities that's involved or in question here. If we're really concerned about the...the welfare and the social tranquility of the people in East St. Louis, I would urge a 'no' vote so that we can look into the...the personalty of Mr. Lou Hill, who in my opinion is the greatest con artist since Yellow Kid Glove Wild who, as you remember, sold Brooklyn Bridge several times. And I think Mr. Hill surpasses him. If we're really interested in this project coming off right to the intent of the interests of the people, we will vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...Representative Younge."

Younge: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Younge."

Younge: "A verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman."



Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded as voting?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bowman: "Oh, that's a terrible mistake, Mr. Speaker. Record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him 'no'. Representative Breslin... desires to be recorded as 'no'. Anything further? Representative Donovan 'no'. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "May I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Friedrich be verified? Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, if I'm in order, I'd like to explain my vote before too many people..."

Speaker Redmond: "You're out of order. Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Can I be verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Abramson be verified? Hearing no objection....Representative Matula."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Matula is verified. Hoffman verified. You're getting too many now. Representative...is that Meyers, I see a couple of fingers sticking up back there? Why can't I see? Oh, people are standing in front of Representative Meyer. Will you please sit down, Representative Telcser and Ryan, Stearney..."

Meyer: "I'm really here, Mr. Speaker. May I be verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "...and Representative Broom. May Representative Meyers be verified. Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "May I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified? Representative... may Representative Harpstrite be verified? I verify that he was a Representative....a very fine one, very concerned about rural telephone service...as was Senator Vadalabene. Will you poll the absentees?"



Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. E.M. Barnes. Deuster. Ebbesen. Virginia Frederick. Grossi. Kane. Kozubowski. Macdonald. McGrew. Molloy. Mulcahey. Pechous. Richmond. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Stuffle. Watson and Sam Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Record me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Representative Ackerman."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we didn't verify the negative Roll... Affirmative Roll Call. We just polled the absentees. Do you move to verify the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Younge: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Loene: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkenbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Brummer. Campbell. Capuzi. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian, please come to the podium?"

Clerk Leone: "Flinn. Friedland. Friedrich. Griesheimer. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Kelly. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Mahar. Margulas. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Steczo. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Sumner."

Speaker Matijevich: "Capparelli, leave to be verified.

Lee Daniels, can you come up here for a minute? Repre-



sentative Ewing."

Ewing: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to be verified. Representative Younge, are you going to persist? I think you were under the impression you needed 89 votes and it's a simple majority but you are going to persist or not?"

Younge: "I...for a while."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, for a while. Representative Macdonald wishes to be verified 'aye'. Representative Oblinger leave to be verified 'aye'. Grossi leave to be verified 'aye'. Vinson...oh, voted 'aye'. Vinson 'aye'. Walsh...leave to be verified? Leave to be verified, Walsh. McBroom, leave to be verified? Leave to be verified, McBroom. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, no shenanigans up there now with you and Lee Daniels."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well everybody is in good hands."

McClain: "Use the podium correctly."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wait until we get in tomorrow on the order of entertainment. You'll have fun."

McClain: "No shenanigans."

Speaker Matijevich: "Helen Satterthwaite. Satterthwaite. Are you...is your mike..."

Satterthwaite: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Satterthwaite 'no'. Pierce 'no'. Van Duyne 'no'. Oh, Van Duyne, the Gentleman from Will."

Van Duyne: "Question of the Speaker. Does that mean one complaint and we're cancelled."

Speaker Matijevich: "What was that, I didn't hear that?"

Van Duyne: "You said we were in good hands. I said, does that mean one complaint and we're cancelled?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson, for what purpose do you rise?"



Vinson: "You did grant me leave to be verified as 'aye',
Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That is correct."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative.
Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk.
Vinson. Waddell. Walsh. Wikoff. Winchester.
J.J. Wolf and Woodyard."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, one moment. The Gentleman
from Cook, Representative Conti, for what purpose
do you rise?"

Conti: "For the purpose of an introduction. I'd like to
introduce in the gallery, 'Dorothy DeVell June', one
of Illinois' most prominent Republicans and native
of Joliet and life-long Republican. Mrs. June served
from 1936 to 1953 as an executive officer in many
state and local Republican organizations. She's
the first woman to ever Chair the Joliet Fire and
Police Board. I would like to also note that Mrs.
June's grandfather, Judge 'George DeVell', was one
of the founders and early office holders of the
Republican Party in Will County and Kankakee County
area. She is represented by Representative Kempiners,
Schoeberlein, Leinenweber, Davis, Murphy and Van Duyne.
We welcome you to the House."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative
Van Duyne...or are you just waving ? All right, okay.
Questions of the Affirmative...Ray Hudson, what
purpose do you rise?"

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if I could
have permission to be verified as 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Hudson as 'aye'? Leave.
Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, I was not recorded on the vote
at all. May I be recorded as 'aye'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "'Aye', Virginia Frederick. Questions of



the Affirmative Vote. Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What is the count?"

Speaker Matijevich: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 88 'ayes',
72 'nays'."

Younge: "All right. Representative Bianco."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bianco. Bianco. Phil's
back there. There he is. Wikoff, for what purpose
do you rise? Wikoff."

Wikoff: "May I be verified please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Wikoff. Representative
Johnson, for what purpose do you rise?"

Johnson: "Well, I make the point of order and leave it up
to the chair that this is dilatory. We're 18 votes
ahead. There is as many missing from one side as the
other. We all want to get out of here tomorrow night.
I would make a point of order that this is dilatory and
ask the chair to rule on it."

Younge: "It is not dilatory, Mr. Chairman. It is a very
serious matter."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright...it won't take...let's all hold
it. It won't take too much longer. Representative
Younge, proceed."

Younge: "Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bluthardt. Ed Bluthardt.
I don't see him on the floor. His golfing partner is
here. Take him off...how is he recorded, Mr. Speaker
(sic)?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off. Mar...Margulas, for what
purpose do you rise?"

Margulas: "Can I ask to be verified please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Margulas. Leave. Proceed
with the...Watson, for what purpose do you rise? 'Aye',
Watson, 'aye'. Proceed, Wyvetter."

Younge: "Representative Boucek."



Speaker Matijeovich: "Who?"

Younge: "Bou..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Oh, Boucek."

Younge: "Boucek."

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

Younge: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Brummer is in...no.

How's the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "Take him off."

Younge: "Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Capuzi is in his seat."

Younge: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Collins is up front in his seat."

Younge: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Matijeovich: "John Dunn. Representative John Dunn.

I don't...he's right here on the podium."

Younge: "Representative Deuster."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Deuster. Representative Deuster. I don't see him. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "Take him off. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified on the Affirmative, please?"

Speaker Matijeovich: "Leave to verify Griesheimer 'aye'. Further..."

Younge: "Representative Ebbesen."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Ebbesen is in his seat."

Younge: "All right. Representative Ewing."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Ewing had leave to be verified, I believe. Representative Bower, for what purpose do you rise?"



Bower: "May I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Bower to be verified. Leave. Proceed, Wyvetter."

Younge: "Representative Grossi."

Speaker Matijevich: "Grossi is in his seat."

Younge: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kane. I don't see him in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Not recorded, proceed."

Younge: "Representative Kozubowski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kozubowski is not recorded. Proceed."

Younge: "Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leinenweber is in his seat."

Younge: "Macdonald."

Speaker Matijevich: "Macdonald. She was verified, that's right."

Younge: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Matijevich: "McGrew was verified. He's here anyway."

Younge: "Representative Molloy."

Speaker Matijevich: "Vince Molloy. Not voting."

Younge: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mulcahey. He's not here. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Not recorded."

Younge: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Matijevich: "O'Brien. How's he recorded, I don't see him."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off. Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you rise?"

Deuster: "I was advised that I was taken off the Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Put him back on. Proceed."



Younge: "Representative Pechous."

Speaker Matijevich: "Pechous is in his seat."

Younge: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Matijevich: "Polk is in the middle aisle."

Younge: "Rigney."

Speaker Matijevich: "Rigney is in his seat."

Younge: "Sandquist."

Speaker Matijevich: "Sandquist..."

Younge: "Schuneman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wait...hold on, Wyvetter. I don't see Sandquist. He's not voting."

Younge: "Representative Schuneman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schuneman is in his seat. Representative Piel, for what purpose do you rise?"

Piel: "Question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I've got a question. Is she verifying the Affirmative or the absentees? Because every other one that she's asked is an absentee."

Speaker Matijevich: "A little of each but we're almost through. Proceed, Wyvetter."

Younge: "Representative Kelly."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kelly. I don't see him. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Younge: "Representative Stanley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stanley. I don't see Representative Stanley. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Younge: "Representative McCourt. McCourt."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mccourt. McCourt. In the back. Oh, he has leave, that's right."

Younge: "Representative Huskey."



Speaker Matijevich: "Huskey is in the back."

Younge: "Representative Davis."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Davis. Is Jack in the back? Center aisle. All right."

Younge: "Representative Meyers."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mahar? Mahar is here."

Younge: "Meyers."

Speaker Matijevich: "How about Meyers?"

Younge: "Ted Meyers."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, he wasn't verified. Was he? Oh, he was verified by the other Speaker, I guess. Yeah."

Younge: "Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hoffman. Gene Hoffman. Is he in his seat? How's he recorded? Oh, he's in the back and he is verified. I'm sorry."

Younge: "Representative Jane Byrne."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who? Jane Bryne, she's in Chicago."

Younge: "Byrnes. Barnes."

Speaker Matijevich: "But she's verified. I'm told she's in Bradley's office."

Younge: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jane Barnes."

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "She's recorded as voting 'no'."

Younge: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tuerk. He can't take her off until we get to that. Representative...who is that you wanted?"

Younge: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tuerk. I don't see him in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Younge: "Representative Waddell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Waddell. It's pretty dark back there."



I don't see him back there. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "Take him off."

Younge: "Representative Walsh."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Walsh had leave to be verified."

Younge: "Representative Wikoff."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Wikoff had leave to be verified."

Younge: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Sam Wolf. He's not recorded? Representative Dunn...John, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "How is he recorded? John Dunn."

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

Dunn: "Okay, I thought I was taken off. I wish to remain at 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeovich: "All right. Return Stanley and Tuerk. Proceed, Wyvetter."

Younge: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Matijeovich: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker...Clerk?"

Younge: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Mugalian 'aye'."

Younge: "Mugalian."

Speaker Matijeovich: "No, Mugalian 'no'. Pechous 'aye'.

What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this...on this question there are 85 'ayes', 73 'noes' and the motion to table prevails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijeovich: "House Bill 891 will be placed on the Order of Third Reading and it takes 107 to get it off, right, George...or to be called today? We'll try to help you out...if things are right. Oh...we'll change the pace for a moment. I'm going to introduce Representative Gordon Ropp who is going to make a further introduction and a very short ceremony.



Gordon Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you the President of the Future Farmers of America for the State of Illinois. This young man comes from the 44th District represented by Sam Vinson, come on up here, Sam, Jerry Bradley, Jerry. The Future Farmers of America, as you may well know, is one of the outstanding youth organizations in this country. And certainly the young man that I am about to introduce to you, I can assure you, exemplifies the leadership that is being developed throughout the State of Illinois. Will you give a kind, warm welcome to the President of the Future Farmers of America from the State of Illinois, Bob Quick from Bement."

Bob Quick: "Thank you. It is indeed an honor for me to have the chance to come here and to bring greetings from behalf...on behalf of the nearly seventeen thousand five hundred FFA members across the State of Illinois. The Future Farmers is an organization which has to show to you a great deal of appreciation and honor for your support of our organization. You know that when I was a little kid, I always had the dream of being right here and addressing you. And now this dream is reality. Well, you see, I've had the chance to make it reality because of you and your support of the FFA. Again, I want to thank you for all of your support because many youths across the State of Illinois do not have the chance to be here where I'm at today and I owe a lot of thanks to you. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "We're going to proceed on the Order of Nonconcurrency on...on page 10, Senate Bill 908, Representative Preston, the Gentleman from Cook."



Preston: "Mr. Speaker, first I rise for the purpose of an introduction. We have with us on the House Floor this morning a trustee of the Sanitary District of Metropolitan Chicago and Committeeman of the township of Evanston, Tom Fuller, sitting over there. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 908 and that it be sent to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Preston moves that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to Senate Bill 908 and a Conference Committee be formed. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede to Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 908 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1053. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, moves that the House refuse to recede on Senate Amend...on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill...oh, that's what I've got down here. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I'd like to do is recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 1053."

Speaker Matijevich: "We're not calling that now. We'll get to that later then. The Gentleman on Senate Bill 563. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, moves that the House refuse to recede on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to...House Amendments #1 and 2 of Senate Bill 563 and a Conference Committee be formed. Correct, bus? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill...Senate Bill 563 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1247. Representative Yourell makes the same motion that the House refuse to recede on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1247 and that a Conference Committee be



appointed. All in say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede to Senate...to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1247 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. On House Bill 1051 on page 4 on Concurrence, the Gentleman from...from Macon, Representative Donovan."

Donovan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, I want to move nonconcurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1051."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves to concur, I understand, on Senate...on House Amendment..."

Donovan: "Nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Apparently there's some confusion. Why don't you take it out of the record for a minute."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take it out for a moment. We'll come back to that. Now we revert back to the Order of Senate Bills on Third Reading. Senate Bill 1272, Emil Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the annual awards for the Court of Claims for FY 79. The total amount of the awards is one million, eight hundred and sixty-eight thousand, one hundred and eighty-eight dollars. And I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves the House do pass Senate Bill 1272. The question, if there's no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1272 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'ayes' and 9 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. And House vs Senate Bill 1272 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Matijevich: "All right. On page 3 on the Order of Concurrence, we're going to go down the list for awhile. The Gentleman from...Rep, Representative Ralph Dunn. Is he in his seat? On House Bill 21. The Gentleman from Henry...Henry, Representative Ralph Dunn. Monroe... Monroe Flinn here? All right. Go and proceed, Ralph."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 21, as you know, passed the House and it passed the Senate. In the Senate, though, they found a technical Amendment that had to be put on it, so the Bill is back over here for a concurrence. And, I'd ask for concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 21."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dunn moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 21. On that, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, I don't know if everybody's paying attention or not, but for those of you who oppose the twenty-one-year-old drinking...return to the twenty-one-year-old drinking law, you'd better pay attention, because this is final action on putting a Bill on the Governor's desk that he has said he will sign. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question. Will he yield? Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Davis: "Representative Dunn, does this Bill contain uniformity throughout the State of Illinois by preempting home rule power?"

Dunn: "Yes, it does. It would be twenty-one throughout the state, if we pass final concurrence with twenty-one... with Senate Bill...House Bill 21."

Davis: "This absolutely preempts home rule power to alter the age from twenty-one to a younger age. Is that correct?"

Dunn: "That's correct."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry. Does this Bill require a hundred and seven votes...or this concurrence?"



Speaker Flinn : "One moment, please, and we'll check.

Well, wait till the parliamentarian finishes here. Well, we haven't ruled on the Senate Amendment, Sir. Well, he's asking about the Bill, and that it's part of the Bill right now. The Senate Amendment does not affect the previous ruling, which was eighty-nine votes."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would probably respectfully dissent from that ruling. However, I understand the parliamentarian's basis for it. I'm going to support this. I've been opposed to this, raising the drinking age to twenty-one. When Representative Yourell presented Senate Bill 2 on this floor, it did not contain that provision. I, frankly, thought that would probably provide the death knell of raising the drinking age to twenty-one, which I still philosophically think is a great mistake to turn a class of nineteen- and twenty-year-olds citizens of this state into overnight criminals, which is precisely what we're going to do when the Governor signs this Bill. I believe that the privileges of the young, that were granted to them in nineteen- and twenty-year-olds, and all the other privileges that this Legislature has granted to them as adults, can tolerate it. I further believe that the driving age should be raised to avoid the driving statistics, but I said to Representative Yourell, who criticized me heavily on this point, that I'm for uniformity in this state, and if that's the will of this General Assembly, and it apparently is, and the Governor, I'm going to vote and put my vote on this Bill, because it does address preemption of home rule. So, that once and for all, this state, if it's twenty-one or twenty-five or eighteen or nineteen, will have a uniform drinking law, and, perhaps, the proponents' arguments that we can solve, traffic fatalities, and we can avoid the trickle down theory, will work. I seriously doubt it, but I suppose I have no alternative but to remain con-



sistent with my philosophy on uniformity. Therefore, I will vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell. Yourell, you're on the air."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I never thought I'd get here. The support of Representative Ralph Dunn's motion to concur...I can tell you, quite frankly, that Senate Bill 2 had, or was going to have the same Amendment, that House Bill 21 had when it passed out of the House and went to the Senate. Now, for those of you who have some disagreement about how many votes it takes to preempt home rule, I refer you to the Constitution of the State of Illinois, Article 7, Section H and I, which clearly states that the state has exclusive power in this area, and that home rule units cannot exercise concurrent powers. The City of Chicago has already done that. Those of you who have that in your minds relative to your vote on this Bill can be assured that this will have nothing to do with that, since the City of Chicago has already raised the drinking age to twenty-one, both for carryout and for consumption on the premise, premises. There...as far as the ruling that was asked by Repre...Representative Davis as to how many votes this measure will take, the parliamentarian of the House ruled eighty-nine, and the parliamentarian of the Senate ruled the same way, that it would take just a majority. So, there are two Bodies in the General Assembly that are in agreement as to the number of votes that it will take to preempt home rule in this area. This is a much needed measure. There is no question about that. The facts and figures bore are flat out. This is the fourth year that we've attempted to raise the drinking age to twenty-one in Illinois, and with your vote to concur, what we've been attempting to do for so many years, will finally become a reality. Thank you."



Speaker Flinn : "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I think everybody in the House knows the issues, but they should be aware that this is final action, and you've got one last chance to reexamine your consciences and reexamine the way you've either been voting or the analysis of this issue. They've given nineteen- and twenty-year-olds, eighteen-year-olds, for that matter, the right to vote. They've given them the right to be married, given them the right to sign contracts. We've also given them the dubious right to go to war and die for their country. But, now, without any statistical evidence, contrary to what Representative Yourell and others have said, that they have abused the right to use alcohol any more than any other group, we're going to suddenly divest them of their right to enjoy the normal prerequisites of citizenship. It's hypocritical, and there's one reason I suggest why we're doing this. These eighteen-, and nineteen-, and twenty-year-olds don't vote, and at least as high a percentage as people in my age group do, and for the record, the statistical evidence I've seen indicates that the twenty-eight- to thirty-seven-year-olds are the worst abusers of alcohol in the privilege of using alcohol that we have in society. But, at least the twenty-eight- to thirty-seven-year-olds have enough good judgment to vote, so that the people in this House and the people in the Senate, and, perhaps, the Governor, have more ^{fear} of them, because they can seek their retribution at the poll. Well, I suggest this is a bad Bill. It's a bad concept. It's inconsistent. It's hypocritical, and I'm not going to change any votes, because everybody's had their mail. The WCTUs got out their letters and their mailing lists and sent it to everybody, so you think ninety percent of the people in your district are for this. They aren't, and I think in



another year or two, when you make criminals of the air-men at Chanute, who's twenty-years-old and has a drink with his family, when you make a criminal of a nineteen- or twenty-year-old in Granite City, who wants to go after he leaves the factory to have a drink with the people who work with him, when you make criminals out of law-abiding citizens and change their whole respect for the system of laws that we have, then we're all going to look at ourselves, and we're going to say, 'We really are a hypocrite.' This is a bad Bill. You've got one more chance to vote 'no' on it. You've got one more chance to either be gone, or vote 'no', or vote 'present', on what, I think, the people of Illinois, and particularly the young people, who are looking to us as leaders and looking to us for a moral example, are going to say, 'You sit on your Mount Olympus, and just because we're a small group in terms of numbers and voting privileges, you're going to wipe out our rights of citizenship.' I urge you to vote 'no' on this motion to concur."

Speaker Flinn : "Represent..."

Johnson: "And, I also ask for a verification if it...no matter how many votes it has if it's over eighty-nine."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr....Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I get lobbied by anymore Pages, I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed. The 'ayes' have it, and Representative Dunn to close. Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to Representative Deuster, because he's the Cosponsor of this..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster is recognized to close on House Bill 21."

Deuster: "Very briefly, I'd like to mention a couple of points."



Dr. Henry Betsy, Director of the respected Chicago Rehabilitation Institute, testified in Committee in both the House and Senate, that his opinion that death, and the maiming of our young people as a result of highway accidents involving drinking on the part of young people is absolutely an epidemic, and that's the reason he strongly supported restoring the drinking age to what it was for many, many years prior to 1973. I would say that every poll that we know of conducted by Legislators on this...the floor of this House, or by the news media, or by anybody who has been polling, shows that the lowest support for raising the drinking age back up to twenty-one is eighty percent. Not only that, as a Representative who represents a district bordering on Wisconsin, I'm happy to report to you that the Governor of the State of Wisconsin supports raising their drinking age. A Senate Committee has recommended voting the drinking age, and they have six Bills pending up at Madison to do that, and my mother's Representative indicated to her in Milwaukee that she is confident that Wisconsin will follow suit and raise their drinking age, so as to reduce that border problem that concerns some. I think this has passed the House and the Senate, and it has been much debated, and I would urge that once again you cast your affirmative 'yes' vote for this Bill, that the people of the State of Illinois, from one end to the other, want."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt, or concur, rather, with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 21?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. While we're getting ready to explain our votes, I would remind you that the TV lights are off. It's against the House rules to film during explanation of votes. Representative Conti. One minute."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm going to vote for this measure, because, as Representa-



tive Yourell says, the City of Chicago and most of the surrounding municipalities that are home rule units have adopted this way before this General Assembly introduced such a Bill. I believe in the twenty-one years of age. Should be raised to twenty-one years of age, but I am going to file a dissent and an objection to the ruling of the Chair that it only takes eighty-nine votes to pass this, because this fellow, Buzz Yourell, is a pretty great guy in citing the Constitution, and I'm reading the Section that he cited here, and Section 3 that he referred to has nothing to do, but with the election of officers."

Speaker Flinn: "Let me interrupt you just...Let me interrupt you just a minute. Is the one camera with the red light on, on the scoreboard, on? Would you turn it off? You're not supposed to take the picture of anything during the explanation of votes. It's against the House rules. Now, proceed. We'll start all over, Representative Conti. You've got a full minute."

Conti: "Well, no, I don't want to start all over. I don't want to take the time of the House, because as I said, I do believe in this, but I...there's one thing that I'm afraid of, that this is an erosion, that every time we feel like it we can preempt home rules, and someone decides, some parliamentarian decides, to just call for an eighty-nine vote instead of a hundred and seven, and that's the only objection I have to it. But, I am voting for this Bill, and it is a good Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Leinenweber. One minute to explain your vote."

Leinenweber: "Thank...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I hope everybody did pay attention to the ruling of the Chair, because by virtue of House Amendment #4, every ordinance in this state and every municipality is hereby, henceforth, once the Governor signs this Bill, been voided. And, I hope you, also, listened to Representative Johnson as to



the hypocritical nature of this particular action today. I happened to be on the Committee that heard this Bill. We had extensive hearings. All of the witnesses that came in to speak on behalf of this Bill, I asked the question, 'If you catch a kid with a twenty-year-old kid with a beer in his hand, are you going to prefer charges against him?', and the answer was, uniformly, absolutely not. Why are we going to pass a law that's going to be totally evaded and ignored? It's stupid, hypocritical, and I would urge you to rethink this decision and vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Richmond. One minute to explain your vote."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A large block of constituents in my district are those in this age group. I represent them, also. I think they're due the consideration of me considering their position very carefully on this, and, certainly, I don't feel that I have the right to take that social privilege away from them. Therefore, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Skinner: "Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker, I vote against this Bill, because it will lead to deaths of my teen-age constituents on their way home from Wisconsin. I feel a little sorry for the Governor, though. He received thirty-five thousand tea bags. Now, he's going to start receiving grocery sales slips, and I suspect that if this passes, teens will start mailing the Governor beer cans. If so, at least the aluminum ones can be recycled. It's a shame people haven't sent him letters on more significant issues, like raising the sales tax in suburban Cook County and in Cook County. Perhaps, they will. He's received twelve according to the Tribune as of yesterday. I've received that many."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mugalian to explain his vote."



One minute. Timer's on."

Mugalian: "If I may explain my vote very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I think this House is being judgmental where it has no right to be judgmental. It's oppressive without any excuse to be oppressive. It's hypocritical beyond our normal posture of hypocrisy. It's cowardly to those in our population who must risk their lives in defense of our nation, and it's discriminatory without any basis for the discrimination. And, it goes totally contrary to this country's history and prohibition. I think that an 'aye' vote is a bad one, and I'm proudly voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Wikoff. One minute to explain your vote. Timer's on."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's not too often that I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Representative Mugalian, but I'm in a hundred percent agreement with him this time. We have, in our previous experience, given this age group the right to do everything else possible under the United States' Constitution, but now we, in our wisdom, are saying that they are not old enough to have a drink. Prohibition didn't work. This is not going to work, and I...for the record, I would like it known that I'm going to join with Representative Conti in filing a dissent motion on this."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Satterthwaite to explain her vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think you've all received the correspondence from the Commission on Children, who have tried to deal with this problem for some time. Their report says alcohol use among youths is a complex problem that involves many influences, including those of parents, education, peers, and personal views. They go on to say that there is no adequate study of the problem in the State of Illinois, or anywhere else in the



nation. Their recommendation, instead of legislation like this, is to put more strict laws on the books and enforcing what we already have and banning carryout sales to nineteen- and twenty-year-olds, since this seems to be the source of much of the alcohol that goes to younger aged children. I think we should support the position of the Commission on Children. I think they know what they're talking about, and it would be much more enforceable than this will be."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich. Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm not naive enough to think that if we passed this law that nobody under twenty-one will take a drink, but I am optimistic enough to hope that we will have fewer alcoholics in the seventeen-, sixteen-, seventeen-, and eighteen-year age group. The Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has found that there are 3.3 million teen-agers who have a drinking problem. Now, I think that's pretty serious in this country, because alcoholism is one of our biggest problems, and, certainly, when it gets down in the teen-agers and starts affecting those that are still in school, then I think we'd better sit up and take notice about it. Now, I know that I may lose a few votes, and I think a few votes are being cast 'no' around here, because they think they might lose a vote or two. All right. So, I'm going to lose some votes in the eighteen-year-old group, but I hope to God that a few less teen-agers will become alcoholics."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Representative Birchler, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wholeheartedly agree with Representative Johnson's statements that he made. I want to add to those statements. You are not able to enforce the law that we have now. How in the world are you going to get enough money to hire enough police and



persons to enforce the law by adding this group to it? We're disenfranchising people that we allow to vote, own property, be citizens, go to war, and I think it's a disgrace to disenfranchise that particular segment of our population."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not going to say that we can enforce this law. I'm not going to say that that stepbrother of mine that...who was drinking and is in the cemetery at the present time, that this law will bring him back nor many of the others, of our young people. I don't know...it's going to be awfully bad whenever we have to come in here and raise the driving age to eighteen or twenty-one, which is being advocated, because of the misuse of alcohol. I just want you to put it on your conscience the next time you look in the mirror, that if you got that red light on and said, 'I did not try to solve this problem in voting. I did not care that these young people become alcoholics.' It is a medical fact that one person out of every twenty that starts drinking, the chemistry in their body is such that they will never quit, and most of them will..."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, please. Your minute's up."

Robbins: "Well, I want to thank you for listening. I see I haven't changed a vote. I believe I've gone backwards, but I have at least stood and asked you to try."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Henry, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. Last night I received a call from my son, who I consider to be a responsible and able and alert young man. He's only nineteen-years-old. He'll be twenty next month on July 20th. Mr. Speaker, I just want to bring to the attention



of the people, I think we are being unfair to people like my son. Just because he's my son, I'm proud of him, but I'm certainly not going to go home and tell him that I voted and took the right from him to have a drink if he's a responsible adult. I have to keep peace at home, so for my son, Conrad, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, to me this issue is one of judgment. Now, all over this country, young people at the age of eighteen have been given the right, because of the people who thought they had the judgment at eighteen to vote, enter into contracts, to serve in the military, and get married, and we're talking, really, the existing law ~~and~~ being at nineteen. There's nothing in the existing law that mandates that anyone go take a glass of beer or a glass of wine, and, to me, if we got confident in the young people to exercise good judgment at the age of eighteen, certainly they ought to have the opportunity to exercise good judgment related to alcoholic beverages at the age of nineteen. That's my reason for...and I have that confidence in them, for voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. When this Bill started, I opposed it. However, I did feel there should be some change in the law, because many problems have come forth in the neighborhoods since the young ^{are} drinking. I think nineteen- and twenty-year-olds should be able to vote in the tavern. We tried to get the Amendment on it. It failed. We need a change, and I don't really like the severe changes, but I admit I made a mistake in supporting the Bill before. I want the young people not to be getting these carryouts so readily, and, therefore, I'm voting



'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger, to explain her vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The thing I'm concerned about is the death and maiming of young people, and I mean this truly. During this last year, three of my very good friends, young people, were killed in automobile accidents, because they had been drinking. They did not know how to handle it. I think this is what we have to look at, plus one more thing when we were young. The biggest death penalty now is coming from mixing drugs and alcohol. People don't know what effect they're going to have, and young people are experimenting with both. If we can keep them from one, maybe we can save their lives."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I speak to you today as a person who's thirty-one-years-old, and who went to high school when the law said you had to be twenty-one-years-old to buy beer or wine. I remember how it was back in those days. Whenever kids, people in my class, went out to drink, they'd get a case of beer, and they'd ride around the city all night long. They couldn't go home until they drank all of their package liquor. They couldn't go home until they were intoxicated. Now, I've heard some Legislators talk about losing friends and young people being killed in car wrecks. Well, when I was nineteen- and twenty-years-old, there wasn't isolated cases or it wasn't a few people that we might know. Almost everyday the newspapers were filled with people who were killed in car wrecks, simply because they were not allowed to go into a tavern and sit down with their friends and maybe drink one or two beers. They had to go...they had to buy



packaged liquor illegally. They had to take it out in their car. They had to drive around until all that liquor was consumed. They couldn't go home with it, because their parents knew it was against the law. It caused a riff between parent and child, and I think to bring this back now after we have about three or four different classes of people, who have had this privilege, would be a bad mistake for the State of Illinois, and I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I fully realize this vote on this Bill is a 'no win' situation. You vote one way, you make some enemies. You vote the other way, you make some other enemies, depending on the class of people and the age bracket. Speaking about the 'no win' situation, I think this General Assembly became losers back in '73 when we did lower the drinking age. I opposed that then, but since we made that mistake, I think we're just compounding the felony by increasing the age at this point, and to those of you who are voting green, I want you to understand that the penalty, if this is enforced, and I don't know how it will be, but if it's enforced, it's a class A misdemeanor, which calls for a penalty of one year or a fine of up to one thousand dollars, and I would...I would re-echo what Representative Ebbesen said a few moments ago. I happen to have enough confidence in the nineteen- and twenty-year-olds to think that they're going to handle this with restraint. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gene Barnes, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going to be very brief as one of the teetotalers around here, and I don't know how many is voting 'yes'



and 'no', so I might have a conflict of interest here. I haven't had any hard liquor or any liquor of any kind since I was a teen-ager, and I don't see that there is no reason, and I don't see that there is no reason that... that's correct. When I was a teen-ager, I did drink beer and wine, and when I went into the Air Force at age two... age eighteen and nineteen, I quit drinking totally and haven't drunk anything since. And, I think that that is an individual decision. I don't know anywhere in the history of this country where we have been able to legislate morals, and that's what you're attempting to do here. That is a judgment that will have to be made by that individual or those individuals. In making my judgment decision, and I would hope others would make the same decision, because I happen to think it's right. But, there is no way any of those young people that live near or Iowa or live near...live near Wisconsin, is simply going to go across those lines. Same way in Chicago. So to assume, because we're going to raise the age to twenty-one, or we're going to raise the age to twenty-five, that those young people are going to cease and desist and not be drinking alcoholic beverages is just so much pie in the sky. I'm proud to vote 'no', and, as I say, it may be a conflict, because I don't drink at all, but I think that is a decision for each individual to make within them...themselves, him or her, after they've reached that age of majority that we have indicated age eighteen is the age of majority. I'm proud to vote 'no' and suggest all of us should be doing so."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Steele, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to urge some more green lights up there. The vast majority of the people of this state, by every survey and every poll that's been taken, say the people, by a large majority, want this



Bill enacted into law. It's needed. In our metro-east area across from Missouri, one of our most serious problems is underaged drinking where people from Missouri come over to Illinois. Their drinking age is twenty-one. It's time we make it uniform. Someone made the argument that we're making criminals of individuals. I'll tell you this, we're creating many more criminals for the local police. Many more criminals for the Illinois police to contend with when we have a difference in drinking age, and when Missouri and Iowa and Indiana residents come over into Illinois, and create disturbances, and fights, and commotions, and traffic problems that we don't need, the taxpayers have to stand that expense. We are causing tremendously more problems for our local police, here in Illinois, by having disunity in the amount...in the age of drinking, so we should move it all back to twenty-one for Illinois, same as Missouri, Indiana, and Iowa."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Brummer: "Yes, I suppose logic has no place in the General Assembly, but I would like to review, briefly, what we are telling the youths of our state if this becomes law. We're saying, 'Youths, we think you're responsible enough. We think you're responsible enough at eighteen to marry, or at sixteen, if you have parental consent. We think you're responsible enough at eighteen to vote. We think you're responsible enough at eighteen to serve in the military. We think you're responsible enough at eighteen to enter into contracts involving millions of dollars, but we don't think you're responsible enough to make a decision as to whether or not you want to have a drink of beer or wine.' That is ridiculous. That is crazy. That is illogical. I don't know how we ever expect the youths to have any respect for the Legislature and for their...the adults, if this is the type of illogical



nonsense that we are...we are asking them to do. We should expect our youths to be responsible. We do expect them to be responsible. We expect them to be responsible in other areas, and we should, also, expect that same responsibility with regard to their decision concerning drinking. I would suggest that the only losers on this are the youths, who we are telling, 'We don't trust your responsibility.', and the only winners will be the scum operators who will continue to serve those same youths anyway."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. John...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One point that we haven't brought out here. Yes, we said, I remember when one of the fancy sooth-sayers on the other side imposed...spoke in behalf of the twenty-one-year-old drinking. But, today, he's there standing, Sponsor of this Bill, opposing it. I...and I... I mean supporting it. I, too, am supporting it with him. much to...much to someone's surprise, but we said, 'Yes, eighteen-year-olders, nineteen-year-olders, twenty-year-olders, you're responsible.', but they proved they weren't responsible, because what did they do? They bought the beer and the wine for the sixteen-, the fifteen-, and the seventeen-year-olders, and we made a whole new group of alcoholics. Our number one drug problem in the State of Illinois, today, is not pills. It's not all these fancy drugs that you read about in the newspaper. It's alcohol, and we're creating a whole new group of drug addicts and alcohol by starting them out at fourteen and fifteen. By raising this age back, it will at least put the people that are a little more..."

Speaker Flinn: "Would, would you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Huskey: "I hope that we get a hundred and seven votes, so we



can end any question on home rule. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative VonBoeckman, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very seldom do I get up and speak on an issue. However, I feel that this is the one time that I am. As a Member of the Motor Vehicles Committee, the reports that have been coming back to that Committee, because... since we have let the nineteen-year-old drink, is astronomical. What we're doing is, we're giving the nineteen-year-olds the right to drink, and they associate with seventeen- and sixteen-year-olds, and if you look at the statistics on the deaths of our teen-agers drinking while driving, it has risen tremendously. There are many things that have been said about the individual's rights. Eighteen-year-old, they go to war. Well, let's face facts. They induct eighteen-years-old simply because they got more guts than brains. And, I think if we all look back in our younger years and say, 'Did we really do that then?' I think that tells it all. I think drinking while driving is one of the major problems we have in the country today, and when you're drinking you have false courage, and you do a hell of a lot of damage..."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you...Would you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

VonBoeckman: "You do a lot of things you're not supposed to do, and I think twenty-one-year-old is the right way to go. I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Flinn: "The...The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a point of view that I think bears some listening to, and that is this. It seems to me that all we're recognizing here, today, we're learning from history. We have conducted here, in the



State of Illinois, a social experiment. This drinking age was, at one time, twenty-one. We lowered it. We conducted this social experiment, and we have found that it has failed. It has failed on many counts. Many of those counts have been recited today, increased motor vehicle accidents, increased alcoholism, and on and on down the list. This social experiment cannot be considered in the same light of some other privileges that we have granted to younger people. They have carried those privileges. They have acted responsibility...responsibly. There have been no disastrous results, so to compare what we're doing here with the lowering of the age with those other experiments, I think is mixing apples and oranges. We are learning from history. This experiment has failed. We are simply trying to readjust. We are learning from history, and we are moving this back to where it was, and I believe that twenty-one we can live with it. And, when I say live with it, hopefully, many, many teen-agers can live with it, rather than being reported as a..."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Hoffman: "...death statistics on our highways."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen... Gentlemen of the House. I guess I started drinking when I was about fifteen. I was going to speak-easies. A lot of you people don't even know what the hell that word means, but in those days a beer in a speak-easy was twenty-five cents. You couldn't consume a hell of a lot of beer, and I don't remember ever getting drunk. And, today, I remember when I first came to this House. All the guys that were in here, the majority of them, were up in age. Hey, look at the young kids you've got in this ...these Members of this House, and it's the same thing



with the army camps you have throughout the state now, Great Lakes, Chanute field, and what have you. Them kids can drink over there, and...the environments of the army camps. Now, what if they get out and go on a pass? What are they going to do? You going to stop them from drinking just because they aren't twenty-one? I say let's keep it at nineteen. Them kids...if they're old enough to fight, they're old enough to drink." Give us some more 'no' votes."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff, to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I just don't understand the red lights that are up there. I'm sure the Legislators aren't listening to what the people are saying. I've just run a poll, and I'm sure any of you have ran polls and have something similar to this. I...out of two thousand returns that I've just had, ninety percent of the people that returned the poll have said they are for the raising of the drinking age, or less than ten percent were opposed to raising this drinking age, and we have tried this. We have experimented. It's been brought ^{out} here. I think we realize now we have made a mistake, and I would say that if we were voting with the people, there'd be a hundred and fifty green lights up there. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sandquist, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll take a look at history. We tried to do something with Prohibition, and you know what happened. It can't...it can't be enforced, and you're talking about these polls that are coming out. Sure the people over twenty-one may be voting on to take it away from nineteen and twenty, but they wouldn't be voting to take it away from themselves. And, I want to tell you, alcoholism is



a problem if we don't have education, but it's a problem whether you're nineteen, twenty-one, or sixty-five. Drinking and driving's a problem, and it's a problem whether it's nineteen, twenty-one, or sixty-five, and we've got to enforce the laws around our books. But, we can't make second class citizens of our nineteen- and twenty-year-olds who have a privilege. And, the second reason I'm for this, is because we've got a problem with home rule. I had Bill 310 in here, which would've preempted the right of home rule and let the Legislature determine what the drinking age should be, but it was in there by itself. It was not combined with the age. This is what I think we have to do, and the House Bill 310's on the next year's Calendar, and I'll be back with that, but... and I hope you will consider that seriously at that time, but now we should vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Before I recognize the next one, if the Pages there are lobbying Representative Bell, I'd suggest they cease and desist. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing about this war, for example, with Wisconsin and Indiana. It was a lot of fun, but consider yourselves officers in that war or that ...or the Army. You are responsible for your men. Now, I have been responsible for men. The first men I would send into a dangerous position, though I would try to protect them best I could, would be the young men, 'cause they don't know any better. They are the ones you send to knock out a machine gun nest or a...or...or whatever weapon it may be, or whatever job you have for them to do. They are the ones you send, because they don't know any better. Neither do the boys and girls of that age know any better in relation to drinking. So, it's up to us as the officers to do our best to protect them. That's our responsibility. Not because they're responsible. Because



we're responsible, and we are accepting and doing our responsibility as we should do as officers, and command the men, sending them out, and maybe ~~to fare~~ to die, or win, or whatever. So, that's why you should vote 'yes'."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent, to explain her vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two points I'd like to make. We say that we are disenfranchising the young people. Remember that when they get married, when they go to war they are trained? All of these things do not hurt somebody else unless they have instructions. That's one point. Another point I'm doing is speaking for the parents. I am a parent of three grown children. At the time that we were raising our children, we had the law twenty-one to hang our hat on. We could discuss, and we could review with our children what the law said. Now, we are taking that right away from the parents by saying that, 'No, the law doesn't stand with us. It goes to nineteen.' I am so glad to see a hundred and six votes up there. I hope we get many more. Let's help the parents for once to try and train the children that are coming up in the future to obey the law and to save the people that they are harming. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, to explain his vote."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are some 'no' votes up there that should be up there. Mine is not one of them. Those 'no' votes are people that happen to live in a district that covers a lot of youths, a university town. They are voting towards their constituents, but the majority of people in this House have said many times that they want to vote towards their constituents. I am voting towards my constituents. One of the Representatives earlier stated that he doubted if ninety percent would be against it. Well, I just re-



ceived an opinion poll back in the last two weeks, and it was ninety-seven percent, so if you want to vote towards the constituents in your district, the great, great majority, over eighty percent of the citizens in this state, want to raise it to twenty-one."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Ropp: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think one of the real things that we have to take into consideration here is the fact that we finally have a chance, maybe, to assist and help the lives of young people. And, I can assure you that the eighteen-, and nineteen-, and twenty-year-olds will still be able to continue to find alcoholic beverages to drink. But, what this may have an opportunity to do, is to prevent the early beginning of drinking by the eleven-, the twelve-, thirteen-, fourteen-, fifteen-, and sixteen-year-olds, and if this, in some way, can prevent those young people from getting involved in this early stage of alcohol and drug abuse, I say, 'Amen', and I congratulate all of those green lights that are up there."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Peoria, Representative Sumner, to explain her vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Have you ever worked with an alcoholic or a drug-addicted person that's wanting to come back into the mainstream of life? If you haven't, it isn't a very pleasant experience. Some of them can never face a normal life again, and if this voting 'yes' for me will help just one young person or old person, it isn't just the young that's hit. It's young and old, and if a 'yes' vote helps just one young person or old person to be able to keep from falling into this pitfall, I'd urge some more 'yes' votes."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there are a hundred and...there are a hundred and nine 'ayes' and fifty-two 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Madigan. Well, wait a minute. Representative Sandquist, for what purpose do you arise? We're getting ready to recess."

Sandquist: "Well, I know Representative Johnson said he was going to call for a verification, and if he doesn't, I will."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. If...if you want...want to do it, that's...that's okay. He didn't persist in it. You were here. Representative Johnson has asked for a verification. I would assume that Representative Dunn is asking for a poll of the absentees. Representative Dunn asked for a poll of the absentees. Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you arise? Waddell?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified, please?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman asked leave to be verified.

Leave is granted. Representative Betty Lou Reed. Reed?"

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified, please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Lady asked to be verified. Okay. Well, I see a whole gang of hands asking to be verified. If someone has a real good reason for leaving, I see nothing wrong with that, but if we're all going to leave,...All right. Read the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Flinn. Hoffman. Kozubowski. Kulas. Laurino. Madigan. Molloy. Patrick."

Speaker Flinn: "The TV lights are back on."

Clerk Leone: "Schlickman. Stearney. And Younge."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sandquist, for what purpose do you arise?"

Sandquist: "Well, I don't like to tie up the House, but I think this is a very important measure, and may I suggest that as name is called on...on the Affirmative Roll Call,



if you're here, we'll verify you, and you can leave."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, I think it's a good suggestion, if we can identify the person and get a nod. Let's...what... Sandquist will be up here, and he'll tell me whether they have leave. I'll just say the word 'leave', and you can leave if you wish. That okay, Representative Johnson? What we're going to...? There are twenty-five or thirty people trying to leave the floor. Now, we'll get to you as soon as we call your name. Representative Johnson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Johnson: "Well, for those of you who think we're being dilatory, all we want to do is get three names off this Roll Call, so that we've got an issue for the court."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Bear with us. Read the Affirmative Roll Call."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Ackerman, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander."

Speaker Flinn: "Alexander? Hold up your hands as we call your hand, we're going to let you leave now. She's got leave."

Clerk Leone: "Anderson."

Speaker Flinn: "Anderson, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Balanoff."

Speaker Flinn: "Balanoff, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Flinn: "Jane Barnes, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Beatty."

Speaker Flinn: "Beatty, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Bell."

Speaker Flinn: "Bell, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Bianco."

Speaker Flinn: "Bianco, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Birkinbine."

Speaker Flinn: "Birkinbine, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt."



Speaker Flinn: "Bluthardt. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Borchers."

Speaker Flinn: "Borchers. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Boucek."

Speaker Flinn: "Boucek, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Bower."

Speaker Flinn: "Bower, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Campbell."

Speaker Flinn: "Campbell, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Capparelli."

Speaker Flinn: "Capparelli, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Capuzi."

Speaker Flinn: "Capuzi, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Christensen."

Speaker Flinn: "Christensen, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Collins."

Speaker Flinn: "Collins, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Conti."

Speaker Flinn: "Conti, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Cullerton."

Speaker Flinn: "Cullerton. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Daniels."

Speaker Flinn: "Daniels, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Darrow."

Speaker Flinn: "Darrow, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Davis."

Speaker Flinn: "Davis, leave."

Sandquist: "Now wait a minute. Wait, wait, wait. Where's Davis?"

Okay. Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Dawson."

Speaker Flinn: "Cullerton, leave. Dawson. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Dauster."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dwight...Dwight Friedrich.

Dwight Friedrich. Turn him on."

Friedrich: "I have a Conference Committee. May I be verified,



please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Everybody's got one, and we're leaving...letting them leave as soon as we call their name and they identify themselves."

Sandquist: "Where is...Where is Cullerton?"

Speaker Flinn: "Cullerton's right here."

Johnson: "Okay. Okay. Go ahead."

Clerk Leone: "Deuster."

Speaker Flinn: "Deuster, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Domico."

Speaker Flinn: "Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Donovan."

Speaker Flinn: "Donovan, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Doyle."

Speaker Flinn: "Doyle, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Flinn: "Ralph Dunn, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Dyer."

Speaker Flinn: "Dyer, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Epton."

Speaker Flinn: "Epton, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Ewing."

Speaker Flinn: "Ewing, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Virginia Frederick."

Speaker Flinn: "Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Friedland."

Speaker Flinn: "Friedland, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Dwight Friedrich."

Speaker Flinn: "Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Gaines."

Speaker Flinn: "Gaines. Proceed. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Getty."

Speaker Flinn: "Getty, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Flinn: "Griesheimer. Proceed."



Clerk Leone: "Hallock."

Speaker Flinn: "Hallock, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Hannig."

Speaker Flinn: "Hannig, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Harris."

Speaker Flinn: "Harris. Proceed. Leave. He's on the phone."

Clerk Leone: "Hoxsey."

Speaker Flinn: "Conti, leave. Hoxsey, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Hudson."

Speaker Flinn: "Hudson, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Huff."

Speaker Flinn: "Huff, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Huskey."

Speaker Flinn: "Huskey, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Dave Jones."

Speaker Flinn: "Dave Jones, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Keane."

Speaker Flinn: "Kane, leave. Keane, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Kelly."

Speaker Flinn: "Kelly, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Kempiners."

Speaker Flinn: "Kempiners, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Kent."

Speaker Flinn: "Kent. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Klosak."

Speaker Flinn: "Klosak. Kent was verified. There was two
of them we verified before we started."

Sandquist: "I know which ones I...you know. There's no...I
understand. I'm not going to break any word to anyone."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. What was the last one? Klosak?
He's here. Henry's here. Leave. Representative Laurino
wishes to be recorded as 'aye', and Representative Leon
wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Jesse White. Record Jesse
White as 'aye'. Proceed. We'll pick those three up. I'll
remember them."



Clerk Leone: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Flinn: "Kornowicz, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Kosinski."

Speaker Flinn: "Kosinski, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Kucharski."

Speaker Flinn: "Kucharski, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Laurino."

Speaker Flinn: "Laurino, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Lechowicz."

Speaker Flinn: "Lechowicz. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Leon."

Speaker Flinn: "Leon, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Macdonald."

Speaker Flinn: "Macdonald. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Mahar."

Speaker Flinn: "Mahar. Mahar's over here. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Margalus."

Speaker Flinn: "Margalus. Margalus, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Matula."

Speaker Flinn: "Matula, leave."

Clerk Leone: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Flinn: "McAuliffe, leave."

Clerk Leone: "McBroom."

Speaker Flinn: "Who was...Who was the last one?"

Clerk Leone: "McBroom."

Speaker Flinn: "McBroom, leave."

Clerk Leone: "McCourt."

Speaker Flinn: "McCourt, leave."

Clerk Leone: "McMaster."

Speaker Flinn: "McMaster, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Meyer."

Speaker Flinn: "Meyer, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Murphy."

Speaker Flinn: "Murphy, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Neff."



Speaker Flinn: "Neff, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Oblinger."

Speaker Flinn: "Oblinger, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Pechous."

Speaker Flinn: "Pechous, leave."

Sandquist: "Stearney. Stearney."

Clerk Leone: "Peters."

Speaker Flinn: "Peters. He's on the phone. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Piel."

Speaker Flinn: "Steele."

Clerk Leone: "Piel."

Speaker Flinn: "Piel, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Polk."

Speaker Flinn: "Polk. He was one of those we verified."

Sandquist: "Yeah, he was. Go ahead. Fine. No problem."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Pouncey."

Speaker Flinn: "Pouncey, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Pullen."

Speaker Flinn: "Pullen, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Rea."

Speaker Flinn: "Rea, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Reed."

Speaker Flinn: "Reed. Betty Lou Reed. She had leave. That's
the third one. Right. Okay. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Reilly."

Speaker Flinn: "Reilly, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Rigney."

Speaker Flinn: "Rigney, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Robbins."

Speaker Flinn: "Robbins, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Ronan."

Speaker Flinn: "Ronan, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Ropp."

Speaker Flinn: "Ropp, leave."



Clerk Leone: "Ryan."

Speaker Flinn: "Ryan, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Schisler."

Speaker Flinn: "Schisler, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Schoeberlein."

Speaker Flinn: "Schoeberlein, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Schraeder."

Speaker Flinn: "Schraeder, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Schuneman."

Speaker Flinn: "Schuneman, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Sharp."

Speaker Flinn: "Sharp, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Simms."

Speaker Flinn: "Simms, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Stanley."

Speaker Flinn: "Stanley, leave."

Clerk Leone: "E. G. Steele."

Speaker Flinn: "E. G. Steele."

Sandquist: "He's over there."

Speaker Flinn: "E. G. Steele."

Sandquist: "I saw the...He's okay. Go ahead."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. All right. Okay. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "C. M. Stiehl."

Speaker Flinn: "C. M. Stiehl, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Sumner."

Speaker Flinn: "Sumner, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Swanstrom."

Speaker Flinn: "Swanstrom, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Taylor."

Speaker Flinn: "Taylor. Right here. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Telcser."

Speaker Flinn: "Telcser, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Terzich."

Speaker Flinn: "Terzich, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Totten."



Speaker Flinn: "Totten, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Flinn: "Van Duyne, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Vinson."

Speaker Flinn: "Vinson."

Sandquist: "I told him he could go, too."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Sandquist: "I gave him leave."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Vitek."

Speaker Flinn: "Vitek, leave."

Clerk Leone: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Flinn: "VonBoeckman, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Walsh."

Speaker Flinn: "Walsh. Proceed. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "White."

Speaker Flinn: "White."

Sandquist: "He's okay. He's gone. He's all right."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed. Yeah?"

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker, this is dilatory."

Speaker Flinn: "No, it isn't. We're... We'll be done when we
get through it here."

Clerk Leone: "Willer."

Speaker Flinn: "Willer. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Williams."

Speaker Flinn: "Williams, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Winchester."

Speaker Flinn: "Winchester, leave."

Clerk Leone: "J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Flinn: "J. J. Wolf, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Woodyard."

Speaker Flinn: "Woodyard. He's there. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "Yourell, leave."

Clerk Leone: "Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Flinn: "Mr. Speaker will be here if you need him.
Stearney. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Would you record me 'no', please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Record Stearney as 'no'. Turn Representative
Sandquist on down there. He has a list. Representative
Abramson."

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

Speaker Flinn: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Abramson: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Flinn: "Vote Abramson 'aye'."

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
I apologize for this extra time, but, believe me, it was
important that it be done in a proper way, and I thank
you all for cooperating."

Speaker Flinn: "You...Do you have any questions of the...Do
you have questions of the Affirmative? Representative
Johnson? Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you
arise?"

Madigan: "Does the Gentleman have questions?"

Speaker Flinn: "I'm..."

Madigan: "Would you recognize me after his questions?"

Speaker Flinn: "I will recognize you as soon as he is finished
with the questions. That'll be the end of this order of
business. We'll get to you. Representative Johnson.
Turn Johnson on."

Johnson: "Bluthardt?"

Speaker Flinn: "How's the Gentleman recorded? He's not..."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take...Well, remove him from the Roll."

Johnson: "Borchers?"

Speaker Flinn: "Borchers? He was here."

Johnson: "Bower?"

Speaker Flinn: "Bower? Bower was down in front and Sandquist
let him go."



Johnson: "Okay. Gaines?"

Speaker Flinn: "Gaines? There he is. Right in front here."

Johnson: "Let's see. Who else do we got? Macdonald?"

Speaker Flinn: "Macdonald's here."

Johnson: "Willer?"

Speaker Flinn: "She was right there just a minute ago. Okay.
How's the Lady recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take her from the Roll."

Johnson: "That's all. We lose."

Speaker Flinn: "She was not verified. She was here in the
meantime. Any further questions? Willer's back. Put
her back on the Roll. Any further questions? What's the
count? On this question there are 111 voting 'aye' and
52 voting 'no', and Representative Madigan wishes to be
voted 'aye'. And, this is 112 'ayes' and 52 voting 'no',
and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority
is hereby declared passed. The House will stand in...
House concurs in the Senate Amendment #1 to...to House
Bill #21, and this Bill having received the Constitutional
Majority is hereby declared passed. The House will stand
in recess till 3:30. Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, it's nice for us to be in recess,
but I don't know if there's many Members know which Con-
ference Committees are on, so if they..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well,..."

Matijeovich: "...if they all head out of here, and the purpose
was to hold Conference Committees, I don't think you can
do much good."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, the ones that were waving slips of paper
at me apparently knew."

Matijeovich: "All right."

Speaker Flinn: "I'll be happy..."

Matijeovich: "You know more than the rest of us."

Speaker Flinn: "The House will stand in recess till 3:30."



Yes, yes, Representative Yourell. Pick up a mic over there. Representative Yourell down the center aisle here.

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move that vote to be reconsidered."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, moves that this vote be reconsidered, having voted on the prevailing side. Representative Ralph Dunn moves that that question lie on the table. All those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...The 'ayes' have it, and the motion's tabled. House is in recess."



Speaker Flinn: "The House will be in order...back in Session from our recess. We need to get a few Sponsors on the Floor and we'll look for those that are on the Floor for nonconcurrency. Representative Ralph Katz (sic) ...oh, not on the Floor. Would the Doorkeeper clear those people out that are not entitled to the Floor? Representative Bradley is not in his office making any deals, he's on the Floor. Pete's on the Floor. O Pete...Peters. On Nonconcurrency we've got...I'll name the Sponsors and if they are within hearing my voice we'll get started. Those are...seem to be the easiest thing to do. Representative Getty, Representative Stuffle, Representative Ropp. Those are three that we haven't handled yet. Representative Peters, Representative Totten, Representative Laurino, Representative Pullen, Representative Hallstrom, Representative Yourell...and he's here. Representative Yourell, how about Senate Bill 1395 on Nonconcurrency? Turn on Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to recede and to concur with the Senate Amendment to Senate Bill 1395."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur with Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1395. All those..."

Yourell: "To recede from the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, to recede, I'm sorry. We're have it listed under...okay. The Gentleman has moved to recede..."

Unknown: "He wants to know what it does, hold on."

Speaker Flinn: "House Amendment #4 on Senate Bill 1395. This takes 89 votes."

Yourell: "The Amendment that I want to recede from was the Amendment that was put on by Representative Bowman that dealt with automatic vacancies in the City of Chicago."



Speaker Flinn: "Okay, any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House recede from Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1395? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that he take it out of the record until we get more of a majority here otherwise..."

Speaker Flinn: "Only...I didn't think there would be any objection. I thought there was going to be a non-concurrence...the reason I called it. So I think if there's no objection we'll let the Sponsor take it out of the record. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "Messages from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in its adoption of their Amendments to the Bills of the following titles to wit: Senate Bill 622, which Amendments are as follows; House Amendment 1, 2, 3 and 4, action taken by the Senate June 28, 1970. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the following titles to wit: Senate Bill 1072, which Amendments are as follows; House Amendment 1, House Amendment 2, action taken by the Senate June 28, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House with the adoption of their Amendments #2 and 3 to a Bill of the following title to wit: Senate Bill 1104, concurred in by the Senate June 28, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by



Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House with the adoption of their Amendments to Senate Bills 1238, 1320, 1342, 1037, 1183, 581, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House with the adoption of their Amendments to the Bill of the following titles to wit: Senate Bill 362 as amended with House Amendments 2, 3, 7, 9 and 12. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following Amendments; House Amendment 10 and 13, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to a Bill of the following title to wit: Senate Bill 490 with House Amendment #1. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House with the adoption of the following Amendments; House Amendment 2 and 3, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to a Bill of the following title to wit: Senate Bill 484 with Amendment...with House Amendments #3, 5 and 7. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of the



following Amendments; Amendments #2, 4 and 8, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the Bill of the following title to wit: Senate Bill 487 with House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following Amendments; House Amendments 4 and 5, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979, Mr. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the Bill of the following title to wit: Senate Bill 1377 with House Amendments 1, 40, 46, 59, 61, 63, 67, 76, 77, 79, 85, 86, 109. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following Amendment; House Amendment 19, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of their Amendments to a Bill of the following title to wit: Senate Bill 905 with House Amendments #6 and 8. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following Amendments; House Amendment #7, action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary.



Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you arise?"

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Under the Order of Motions I have House Bill 1065, (sic) the motion to take from the Table and place on the Calendar on Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. I would like to ask leave to have this postponed to...or added to the Spring Calendar."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there any objections? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Do I understand the request is to put a Bill on the Spring Calendar which is not on our Calendar presently?"

Speaker Flinn: "It's on the Table. It's listed on the... on page 13...how well...on to his motion."

Getty: "1069 is a Bill which I think there's been some question about in the past with our rather meager attendance here, I just wonder if the Gentleman would take that out of the record and we could check on it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record. The request is taken out of the record, not the Bill. We'll go back to Senate Bills on Nonconcurrency and ask if the Sponsors are on the floor...Representative Getty. Representative Getty is recognized for Senate Bill 289."

Getty: "No, no, no, no. I'd like you to go back to that... Representative Winchester's motion on 269 as long as it's on the board."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay."

Getty: "And I've taken a look at it...the Gentleman's request is that it go on the Spring Calendar, is that correct? I have no objection."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Winchester, has this Bill been reported out of Committee?"



Winchester: "It was..."

Speaker Flinn: "How was it tabled, do you know?"

Winchester: "It was tabled under Rule 25...25b."

Speaker Flinn: "Ran out of time."

Winchester: "It ran out of time, correct."

Speaker Flinn: "Was it on Third Reading at the time?"

Winchester: "No, it was...it was heard in Committee, it was defeated by...there wasn't enough Members in the Committee. It did not get enough votes to be reported out. I filed a motion to discharge the Committee and then we did not make the deadline of the Rule 25b. Then I filed a motion. It went to the Order of being placed on the Speaker's Table. Then I filed a motion to go to that Order and we've been filing those motions ever since. So it's on the Speaker's Table. I'm just asking that it be postponed, I assume in that same posture, until next Spring. We may have to take it from the Table first."

Speaker Flinn: "Maybe...maybe a better idea would be to put it on Interim Studies since it has never been reported on the House Calendar, it's been in Committee. Do you agree with that?"

Winchester: "I will accept that."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. The Gentleman has asked leave to place this Senate Bill, 1069, from the Table and place it on the Interim Study Calendar. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Attendance Roll Call will be used. Representative Vinson:"

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm looking here at a first Conference Committee report on House Bill 112 which has only been signed apparently by three House conferees, only one of the names is legible. The names aren't typed under the names. It's my understanding that Rule 68a requires the names be typed under the names and



I just want to indicate that I'm going to object to any Conference Committee report where that rule isn't adhered to."

Speaker Flinn: "You're talking about three...Representative Vinson, are you talking about three total names. There was not a majority of names on the..."

Vinson: "No, three of the House conferees have signed it, only three. Now I realize that is adequate but the problem is the names aren't typed under the signatures."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, you're objecting to that fact..."

Vinson: "That's right. The signatures are just totally illegible."

Speaker Flinn: "That's a valid point. They'll have to be redone. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, for the record and to answer Representative Vinson, my name doesn't appear on it either. Apparently, through some clerical error, I was advised by one of the Gentlemen involved in the Bill ...apparently through a clerical error it was submitted. Because the record would reflect it was submitted even prior to the convening of the Conference Committee and apparently was just a staff typographical error. I believe it is the intention of the House Sponsor to, and the Senate Sponsor indicated her concurrence, to add...that this is an erroneous Conference Committee report and a corrected Conference Committee report for it would be filed."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. What we're going to do is all those reports that come down here to the well that does not have the Members names typed underneath the signature will be rejected by the Clerk's office here in the well and we'll get them right the first time. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to Representative Vinson, I resent the fact that you can't read my name



on that Conference Committee report. Next you're going to tell me you thought I was Charlie Chew."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, under nonconcurrency is...and let's go back through the list again. Representative Getty, are you ready to nonconcur on Senate Bill 289 and take it out of the record? What...Stuffle is not here. I'm going to go through the names of the Sponsors and if they're interested in moving them on nonconcurrency I wish they would respond. Representative Peters, out of the record. Representative Totten, he's not here. Representative Laurino, I don't see him either. Representative Pullen, is she here? There she is. How about Representative Pullen. How about Senate Bill 277, do you want to move to nonconcur? Do you want to take it out of the record? Well, all right, to move to recede requires 89 votes. You've got to wait. All right, Hallstrom, is she back? I don't see her. Yourell has tried that once and he wants to recede and that takes 89...and Gene Hoffman. Okay I think we've got a couple more requests here. Just a minute, let me check. Representative Bullock has filed a motion to take from the Table Senate Bill 1340 and I understand that he wishes now to take from the Table and place on Interim Study...that Bill. Is that correct, Representative Bullock?"

Bullock: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I would like suspend the appropriate rule and use the Attendance Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave to do this, use the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Bowman...Interim Study. Representative Bowman has a request to...on the...under the motions to take from the Table Senate Bill 625 and place on Interim Study. Is that correct, Representative Bowman."



Bowman: "That is correct, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Does the Gentleman have leave?
Hearing no objection, we'll use the Attendance Roll
Call and place Senate Bill 625 on Interim Study."

Bowman: "Thank you. You may turn my microphone off."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten, for what purpose do
you arise?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're looking around the
Calendar for something to do. The Speaker promised
me that we would move that Constitutional Amendment
as soon as it got engrossed to Third Reading and I'd
like to do that."

Speaker Flinn: "Well let me try to pick up some..."

Totten: "Well, I've waited patiently. In fact, many Members
have been here and have been out of this Chamber and
they've given them a chance to call their Bills. I've
waited patiently, been here every day on time and I
think I ought to have the opportunity to^{at} least have
that moved to Third Reading."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, all right. If the real Speaker
promised you that, he'll do it. And I'm going to
move along and try to pick up... Representative Davis,
on Senate Bill 618, you had a motion to move and take
from the Table. Do you also wish to move that on
Interim Study? Representative Davis. Jack Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move it to
Second Reading and then commit it to the Spring
Calendar."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, if it gets on Second Reading the time
has expired and...and then it would take you 107 votes
to revive it under any circumstance."

Davis: "But, Mr. Speaker, if we move it Second Reading now
and then an immediate motion to commit to Spring
Calendar..I don't know if that's possible in a
parliamentary fashion..."



Speaker Flinn: "Well I don't know either..."

Davis: "That's why I referred to it."

Speaker Flinn: "I would have to ask the Parliamentarian."

Davis: "Well, in that case, let's move it to Interim Study."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, your point is to try and get it on the Spring Calendar as opposed to Interim Study?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Well let me...Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, I think that the Chair is absolutely right. I think there would be procedural problems. I think there would none with Interim Study, however."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have what I think is a noncontroversial concurrence. I think it's Senate...House Bill 1679...16..."

Speaker Flinn: "Let's get Jack...Jack Davis' problem straightened out and then we'll move to that. We're not out of things to do, we're sort of rocking around until we get an audience. Representative Davis, you probably won't have any problem getting on Interim Study, is that your desire?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave to place Senate Bill 618 on the Interim Study Calendar? Hearing no objection, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Representative John Dunn, now which concurrence were you talking about?"

Dunn: "All right, this is House Bill 169...79...1679."

Speaker Flinn: "All right, we had planned to go to the top of that Order but if you think you won't have any problem with no more attendance than we've got, we'll go to there. House Bill 1679, Representative John Dunn is recognized for a motion."

Dunn: "I would move to concur in...the number of the Amendment slips me, but the Senate Amendment in...to



House Bill 1679. This is a Bill relating to teacher's residents within the school district. There was some concern as to whether the City of Chicago is eliminated. There was a clarification in the Amendment with regard to that in the Senate. And that's all the Amendment does. The Bill is coming back essentially and substantively the same as it left the House. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten, on the Gentleman's motion."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the...is this the Bill that had required teachers...the teachers did not have to live within their district to be teachers?"

Dunn: "That is correct."

Totten: "What prompted you to introduce this Bill?"

Dunn: "It is my understanding that there are a handful of districts downstate where this type of legislation would be applicable. For the most part, there is no such requirement in the great majority of the districts in the State of Illinois. But downstate where you have a small community in which the school is located, there are, in many instances...just in fact, is not housing within that community...and teachers have to live in smaller communities or villages nearby. And so downstate in small districts to require someone to live within the district is just not practical."

Totten: "What...okay. What did the Senate Amendment do that you're concurring in now?"

Dunn: "The Senate Amendment was an attempt to clarify the language that Chicago is excluded."

Totten: "Well how did it do it? What's the wording now?"

Dunn: "Let me see if I can get the file."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich."

Totten: "Wait a minute."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, I'm sorry, I interrupted Representative



Totten. Proceed."

Dunn: "I have the file. Let me see if I can...Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1679 says, 'This Section shall apply only to school districts having less than five hundred thousand inhabitants'."

Totten: "Okay, that would then effectively exclude the City of Chicago and make it apply all over. Why not include the City of Chicago?"

Dunn: "I really don't know. I think...well, from a practical standpoint, I'm not sure you could pass the Bill, if that's what you want to get at."

Totten: "Well..."

Dunn: "And I'm not addressing myself to any problems or lack of problems which they might have. And I think if someone wishes to introduce a Bill with regard to that they certainly can. But this Bill is addressed to a problem which does exist downstate in smaller communities..."

Totten: "Okay, but as you're..."

Dunn: "...and then only."

Totten: "Okay, John, as you originally introduced the Bill, it was apparent that it probably went statewide. I think it was a good Bill and I probably voted for it, I don't know. But to exempt the City of Chicago all of a sudden seems to make a good Bill bad. And I don't think you ought to concur in the Amendment. You ought to leave the Bill the way it was as it went out of the House. You ought to exempt the City of Chicago from this...or the teachers from having to live in the district. That's ridiculous."

Dunn: "My recollection, I will confess, is somewhat vague but it is my understanding that this Bill, as introduced, did not intend to affect the City of Chicago in any way. Because the Section of the Code that is referred to in this legislation is a different



Section from that which applies to the City of Chicago. There was some confusion about that and there was a House Amendment, I think, to make that ...to make that clear and the Senate apparently didn't think it was quite clear enough so they put this Amendment on which spells out that this Bill shall apply only to communities of five hundred thousand or less."

Totten: "What was the Amendment that Representative Walsh tried to put on this Bill on Second Reading that failed?"

Dunn: "Representative Walsh's Amendment which was not put on the Bill provided that residency within the school district shall not be considered in determining the employment or the compensation of a teacher or whether to retain, promote, assign or transfer that teacher. In other words, it completely changed the intent of the Bill and was not adopted."

Totten: "Okay, I have no further question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson. Representative Anderson. Turn Anderson on, please."

Anderson: "Representative Dunn, would you yield to a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Anderson: "Yes, is House Amendment still...House Amendment 1, was that adopted?"

Dunn: "I'm looking through the file and I think it was. Yes, it was."

Anderson: "Can you explain to me what that Amendment did? in printout I have..."

Dunn: "Yes, the..."

Anderson: "...it's not too clear."

Dunn: "The...House Amendment #1..."

Speaker Flinn: "I think that would be out of order in the



first place. I believe we ought to discuss the Senate Amendment which is what we're discussing."

Anderson: "Well this is...no, no, Mr. Speaker. This is on the whole Bill. This is concurrence. Now..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well I know but we're concurring in Senate Amendments, not House Amendments."

Anderson: "All right then, I'd like to speak against Senate Amendment #1. I think..."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. I took this Bill because I thought it was noncontroversial."

Dunn: "So did I. If you want to...I'm willing..."

Speaker Flinn: "How about taking it out of the record..."

Dunn: "I'll take it out of the record. I didn't..."

Speaker Flinn: "We've been on this too long. I'm trying to get an audience out here and..."

Dunn: "There shouldn't be any controversy about this at all. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman requests to take it out of the record. Representative Yourell, are you willing to try yours. Representative Bowman has come up and indicated that he would not object to your receding from his Amendment. Senate Bill 1395, under nonconcurrency."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to recede from House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1395 and to concur."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I offered House Amendment #4 to Representative Yourell's Bill. He was gracious enough to let me use his Bill for this purpose. It is issue that I have fought for on a number of other occasions on this floor. When the Bill got back to the Senate, Senator Maragos, who is the Senate Sponsor of this legislation, expressed some serious objections to it."



And the...since the Amendment is much more controversial than the Bill itself and since Representative Yourell is very gracious to let me do this and since Senator Maragos, who is the Senate Sponsor, is strenuously opposed to this, I will support Representative Yourell in his motion to recede. I will continue the fight, however, in the spring time when we can go to the spring order...the Bills on the Spring Calendar. And ...but at this time, I have no objections to receding from this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell has moved to recede from House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1395. This final action. It takes 89 votes. 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 133 voting 'aye' and 0 voting 'nay'. And Senate Bill 1395 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Under concurrences...and the House does recede from Amendment #4. Under concurrences, Representative...Field Marshal Griesheimer has promised me that House Bill 444 is not controversial and that's on page 3. Representative Griesheimer, for the purpose of a motion."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 on House Bill 444. This was the Bill that applied to forest preserve districts and how they could annex property to the forest preserves within the municipalities. The only measure of any objection to this Bill when it was in the House was its application to DuPage County. In the Senate they did limit this to counties below the size of six hundred thousand. That removes that objection. It further adds addition protection to forest preserves who are in negotiations for acquisition



of land immediately adjacent but not within the municipalities. And it also adds a paragraph for the development of recreational facilities in operation thereof in districts with a population of twenty-five thousand so that they can construct these. I do not believe that any of these three are controversial. I certainly agree with them. They solved the wholly local problem in Lake County. I would move concurrence."

Speaker Flinn: "The prairie fox...desert fox, isn't it ...has moved...is it prairie? Okay...has moved to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 444. And on that motion, to speak, is Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think if the Field Marshal is prepared to lead us this is the kind of ammunition he should use. What...what does this do in regards to eminent domain?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "This has nothing to do with eminent domain whatsoever. It merely says that if a forest preserve district wishes to annex property within a municipality, in counties less than six hundred thousand, that it must obtain the concurrence of the village or city body that rules that municipality."

Totten: "Does the concurrence mean that only the village body has concurred, not the people?"

Griesheimer: "Well the governing body of that municipality, that's right."

Totten: "So it means that if a municipality and a forest preserve agree, then they could swallow up a whole development and make it a forest preserve. If they wanted to wipe out, say a minority group that lives in their community and they didn't like the minority group, the municipality and the forest preserve could



agree, make the area that the minority group lived in a forest preserve and force the minority group to move some place else."

Griesheimer: "Let me point out, Representative Totten, that at the present time, under existing law, the forest preserve can...Representative Totten, under existing law, a forest preserve can do that right now without any feedback from the municipal governing body. That's the existing law. This would make that example you gave less likely."

Totten: "Well, now you can make two parties responsible for a bad act rather than one."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a little disappointed in the type of action that is being taken on this Bill. We spent a great deal of time in the Counties and Townships Committee with this. Representative Griesheimer did everything he could to work with both the municipal people and the forest preserve people. I think that the Bill is good. If he is ready for the concurrence of this Amendment, I want to support him whole-heartedly. And I don't like any type of action as I am seeing taking place on this Bill with the intentions that were involved. I would support of Representative Griesheimer's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Sponsor a question? Representative Griesheimer, I did understand you to say that you had very graciously put a population figure in so that it did not affect DuPage County's problem. Isn't that correct?"

Griesheimer: "I did not put it in, Representative Dyer. The Senate did and I'm moving to concur with that."

Dyer: "I certainly share...I'm going to thank Representative Griesheimer and I certainly would support his motion to



concur."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this motion to concur in House Bill 444. As Chairman of the Committee in which this Bill was heard, not on one occasion but I think perhaps more than two occasions, Representative Griesheimer met with those who were in opposition to the Bill and changed the Bill at that time and on those occasions to what I thought were conciliatory arrangements with the opponents. And if he's satisfied that this Bill is now in the shape that he thinks it ought to be, I would hope that you would all support his motion to concur."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster. If we get anymore noncontroversials we'll be here all night."

Deuster: "I'm sorry to ask a question, but this was the Bill that when it was introduced, Representative Griesheimer, as I remember...all sorts of members of the Lake County Board, converged on me and said it's a bad Bill, it ought to be defeated and then you amended it. And I wonder if you wouldn't...if you could briefly explain how it's been changed so that it's acceptable to our people in Lake County. And I'm sorry to...at this late hour ask you that but..."

Griesheimer: "All right, I did this..."

Deuster: "...I need to know."

Griesheimer: "...before but I'll go through it again."

Deuster: "If you did to the House just now..."

Griesheimer: "Senate Amendment #1 restricts this Bill so it only applies to counties of six hundred thousand or less. Senate Amendment #2 provides that if the district forest preserve/ is in negotiations for acquisition of the land with owners of land adjacent to a municipality



the annexation of the land shall be deferred for six months. That will give more than adequate time to the forest preserve district to fairly and equitably conclude their negotiations and the municipality may not cut them off. However, the basic concept of the Bill, that a forest preserve may not go within the municipal boundaries of an existing town and take land without their permission is the still the backbone of the Bill. We did this because of...I know you know, some unreasonable actions taken against the City of North Chicago. This was requested by the City of North Chicago and their Mayor and Alderman. As long as our forest preserve district in Lake County plays square they'll have no trouble living with this. And if they try to steal property from a municipality, this will prevent it."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer, do you wish to close?"

Griesheimer: "No, Sir, and I apologize."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House ...Representative Walsh, I'm sorry I overlooked you. I knew your light was on."

Walsh: "This troubles me with respect to the effect it has on...on DuPage County. Now we make a distinction, apparently, that six hundred thousand...the population of DuPage County is right around six hundred thousand. Now this...this would mean then, the effect of Senate Amendment #1, that the law remains status quo with respect to the acquisition of land within municipalities by forest preserve districts. If it's good for the Lake County Forest Preserve District, it seems to me, it's good for the DuPage County Forest Preserve District. And I really don't get the point in Senate Amendment #1. Would you respond to that,



Mr. Sponsor?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Yes, I'll try to respond to that. When this matter was taken up in the Senate, it was pointed out that DuPage County has already established a certified forest preserve plan that has evidently been agreed to by the Mayor's Council and the forest preserve district. And because of that, this particular protection was not being necessary for DuPage County. And it's my understanding that this Amendment was offered in the Senate by a Representative from DuPage County and thus we established...or they established the six hundred thousand limit. And therefore, DuPage and Cook County are not subject to the terms of this particular Bill."

Walsh: "Now is Senate Amendment #3 a part of this Bill?"

Griesheimer: "Senate Amendment #3 is a part of this Bill."

Walsh: "And I might add, and I'm speaking to the Bill now, Mr. Speaker. The significant part..."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Walsh: "...since it reduces the population limit from one hundred thousand to twenty-five thousand for the purpose of issuing revenue bonds for various recreational facilities. I submit to you that that's probably the most significant aspect of the Bill and something that some Senator had some special interest in over there that perhaps didn't get out of Committee. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that...that is something that we should not take up on just a moments notice."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Griesheimer, do you wish to close?"

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think everything has been said on this. I assure you that this...the basic Bill applies to Lake County. A particular problem we had there is...as one of the two prior Speakers referred to,



insofar as the third Amendment that Representative Walsh referred to, I believe this is solely being done for a particular localized problem in...I believe it's in Kankakee, I think it was Representative Kempiners that had the situation. I see nothing wrong with it. I truly felt this was noncontroversial."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the Senate... that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 444. 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 112 voting 'aye', 5 voting 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. Representative Wikoff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After the last couple of Bills I'm not sure anything is not controversial any more but I think this probably comes as close as any. I would ask leave that we might go to a Conference Report for 1541. I think this is all agreed upon now."

Speaker Flinn: "What was the Bill number again?"

Wikoff: "House Bill 1541, Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Flinn: "What page do you see it on the Calendar? We don't see it."

Wikoff: "I don't even have a Calendar here, I'm not sure. I don't know, maybe it isn't even on the Calendar yet."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten, can you help us?"

Totten: "Is he talking about a concurrence or a Conference Committee Report?"

Wikoff: "Conference Committee."

Totten: "Well a Conference Committee Report has to be on the Calendar for a certain amount of time."

Speaker Flinn: "Well we don't have a Calendar..."

Wikoff: "I don't have one either."



Speaker Flinn: "There's a Supplemental Calendar being printed. If there's going to be objections then we won't hear it. All right, take that out of the record ...the request out of the record. On page 6 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1774. That's out of the record, Tim. For what purpose do you arise, Representative Simms."

Simms: "I brought the point up first thing this morning, Mr. Chairman, on these Conference Committee Reports. I know the House Member's names are being typed..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well..."

Simms: "...but our rules call for the Senate Members too."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. What we...while you were off the floor we decided that the Clerk's well here will not accept those that don't have the typewritten names underneath."

Simms: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schisler on House Bill 1774."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to concur with House Bill 1774. The Senate put an Amendment on, Amendment #1, really which is innocuous because we already have that in the law that says that they shall have...that someone hunting deer shall have four hundred square inches of vivid blaze orange material while hunting deer and upland game. We already have that in the law so I see no point in arguing that."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1774. All...Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, the noise in here is just terrible. I didn't hear one word that the Sponsor said."

Speaker Flinn: "All right, I agree with you the noise level is pretty high. Let's have some order. Representative Schisler, would you explain again what Senate Amendment #1 does so if anybody..."



Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 would...says that a hunter hunting deer should have four hundred square inches of material on his clothing, caps and vests and so forth, and also while hunting upland game during season. That's already in the law so I don't see any argu... any point in arguing it. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of ...the concurrence...the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1774. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 130...141... 141 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. Same Sponsor, House Bill 1777, Representative Schisler for a motion. Representative Schisler. Turn Schisler on, please."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1774. The Amendment says that you would not be able to fish in the Kankakee or Iroquois River from April 1 to May 31 of each year. I move the adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I've got the same problem I had in this last one. I can't hear a thing."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Let me try it again. Would the Members please be in their seats and stop all the conferences going on on the floor. If you just must talk, talk in a little lower tone of voice. Representative Schisler, would you again explain what Senate Amendment #1 does to House Bill 1777."

Schisler: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 would prohibit fishing



on the Kankakee and Iroquois River from April 1 to May 31 of each year."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "This Senate Amendment prohibits fishing on the Kankakee River in what period of time?"

Schisler: "Between April 1 and May 31."

Totten: "Why would you want to do that?"

Schisler: "I would say to the distinguished Gentleman, I didn't want to...this Senator Joyce put the Amendment on."

Totten: "Well, if you don't want to why are you concurring?"

Schisler: "I intend to have it amendatorily vetoed out, if you want the truth."

Totten: "Well, we ought to not...to give the Governor all that power. He does some fishy things now and this one would be really... This one could dry up the Kankakee River. I...this is not in my district so I don't know whether the Bill may put the Kankakee River in my district. But I'd defer to Representative Ryan and McBroom because it goes right through their district."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Ryan: "Representative Schisler, the Iroquois River, is that ...that's not included in this river...in this Amendment?"

Schisler: "It says Kankakee or Iroquois Rivers"

Ryan: "Well as I read it it says...it shall be unlawful to take, disturb or lure any fish, minnows, frogs, turtles or mussels or any part there from April 1st to May 31st both inclusive in or from any tributary flowing into the Kankakee-Iroquois Rivers, except for the Iroquois River itself."



Schisler: "Yes, I see you're right."

Ryan: "Yeah, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we should point out what this Amendment does. It says it's unlawful/ ^{to} take or disturb any turtle, fish and so on. They use the word disturb. If you go up and touch a turtle, you're liable to an offense under this Amendment. And I, therefore, submit to you it's rather ludicrous and I urge it be defeated. It should be a Class X offense, however."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, there can be nothing worse than a battery on a turtle, absolutely nothing. It deserves nothing less than certainly a Class X felony punishable by at least six years in prison."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schisler. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Sponsor of this Amendment is here now and has clarified it somewhat to me. He says that it's only...only means for tributaries that flow into those two rivers."

Schisler: "That's right."

Ryan: "Oh, I see. And it's to take care of the small-mouth bass and red horse to flow there and it has to be handled during their spawning period which is April 1st to May 31st. And I have no objection to the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Representative Schisler, do you care to close. You moved for the adoption...the concurrence..."

Schisler: "Move...move for the adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1777. 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 question there are 143 voting 'aye' and 11 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1777. On page 7, Representative Kent has asked...I've got a few requests here and then we're going to get back in order rather than jump around. Representative Kent has asked that we call 2321 and that's also a noncontroversial. Representative Polk, for what purpose do you arise? All right. Representative Kent, for a motion on 2321."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2321. This is a Commerce Commission Bill and the Amendment just clarifies how the penalty will be assessed on those under one hundred thousand dollars revenue."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the Lady has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2321. 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. Representative Conti."

Conti: "I wanted to ask a question. Is it too late to ask a question on it?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, go ahead and ask it."

Conti: "All right. Representative Kent, it says it provides that any public utility which fails to make and file reports called for by the Commission within the time specified, or to answer any questions propounded by the Commission within thirty days from the time it is lawfully required to do so, with such...further time not to exceed ninety days as may be allowed by the Commission. Are you talking about the Commerce Commission now?"



Kent: "I'm talking about the Commerce Commission, yes, but the Amendment just sort of clarifies how those penalties...the whole Bill was set up so that those small private utility companies would have a different...would have an allowance, sort of, that would be determined by the Commerce Commission of what their penalty would be."

Conti: "Am I to understand that the penalty is going to be one hundred dollars each day in default if the utility collects less than one hundred thousand dollars annually in gross revenue?"

Kent: "Just the reverse."

Conti: "Well then there must be something wrong with my analysis here because it says one hundred dollars per day in default if the utility collects one hundred thousand dollars annually in gross revenue."

Kent: "Or more...or more. The large utilities, at this point, pay that much. But this Bill is to relieve those small utility companies that do not gross over one hundred thousand dollars, and we do have many of those."

Conti: "I'm afraid that...I'm afraid, Mary Lou, I don't mean to interrupt you. I'm afraid there may be a technicality there. I don't see anything in...as more, unless it's an analysis...an error in the analysis. Does the Bill read that?"

Kent: "Yes, the clarification Amendment reads that way."

Conti: "I see."

Kent: "All it did was just to clarify what was a small utility."

Conti: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Flinn: "On this question there are 150 voting 'aye' and / none voting 'nay'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to



House Bill 2321. House Bill 2325, it's on page 7.

Representative Barnes, for a purpose of a motion, is recognized."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, it's 2355."

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear you."

Barnes: "It's 55 not 25."

Speaker Flinn: "I see, 2355. I'm sorry."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2355. This was a Bill, Title and Act to...regards to certain obligation owed to the state and amends certain Acts in relation thereof. The Senate Amendment amended the paragraph on deductions for the warrants ... for arrests or claims in favor of the state's statement reason...statement of reason for the State Comptroller. It adds that the Comptroller may establish by rule or regulation conditions for use of this Section, including the minimum amount of the claims... account to be collected. This legislation...become effective upon being enacted into law. And I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2355."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2355. And on that motion, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Barnes, when this left the House, the Bill authorized...the Attorney General to authorize the Comptroller, basically as I understand it, to write off small claims of one hundred dollars or less, which are more than three years old, as non-collectable. Was that correct?"

Barnes: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "Now, the effect of the Senate Amendment #1



appears to authorize the Comptroller himself to make that determination, is that the affect of the Senate Amendment?"

Barnes: "No, this is a different Section of the statute, it does not. It has not changed that Section that you're speaking of."

Leinenweber: "In other words, the Senate Amendment is a wholly different item than the Bill itself?"

Barnes: "The...what the effect of the Senate Amendment is... is that the original Bill as it went out of the House, is still intact. This is an addition by the Senate Amendment."

Leinenweber: "All right."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative..."

Leinenweber: "Wait a minute, I still have some more questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, go ahead."

Leinenweber: "Would you once more then explain what the additional provision says? I'm having difficulty understanding it."

Barnes: "What it does, in effect, if there's a debt outstanding, it allows the Comptroller to collect that debt and promulgate rules as it relates to the collection thereof. That's what it does."

Leinenweber: "In other words, if the State of Illinois owes money to a provider who also owes money to the state, that the Comptroller is given authority to provide a setoff."

Barnes: "That's generally correct, right."

Leinenweber: "What is the necessity for this? Is there... been a demonstrated problem with this is attempting to solve?"

Barnes: "Yes, in terms of the...the Comptroller...the problem cropped up in the Department of Revenue quite often in terms of paying income tax refunds, especially



in areas where people owe certain debts...to the state."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson."

Barnes: "Mr...Mr..."

Vinson: "He covered my questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, all right."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I would then move that the House do
concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur
with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2355. 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
question there are 145 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay'.
This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority
is hereby declared passed and the House does concur
in Senate Amendment #1 to 20...to House Bill 2355.
Representative Peters is recognized for a motion for
House Bill 2301."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
I rise to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to
House Bill 2301. House Bill 2301 required that all
school children operated by school systems show
proof of health examination and required immunizations
under penalty to the school districts. A number of
questions were raised by Members of the House at that
point and I think that those questions have been
answered in terms of the two Amendments which have
been added by the Senate. Amendment #1 indicates that
once a school district has achieved the required
number of children immunized, any funds that might
have been due to that school district will be returned
and reimbursed to that school. The second Amendment
provides that the implementation of this Act shall not
begin until October 15th of 1980 at a 80% level and the



year after, in 81, at a 90% level. The school boards, the Public Health Department in the City of Chicago, all parties now seem to be in agreement that they can live under this Bill and achieve the goals set by this in terms of immunization of children for the diseases we know as childhood diseases. I would move concurrence of Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2301."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the concurrence of Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 2301. And on the motion, Representative Schneider, is recognized."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is kind of a tough proposition to discuss in a couple ways. One is, there is an effort by this legislation to get schools to comply with immunization requirements. And I think the Sponsor and the Commission is in good... intention, has tried to determine a way in which they can get schools to comply. I think presently the law denies children access...or entrance, rather, to the school in the event that they are not immunized. However, it appears not to be working. So that, I guess, is the beginning of the dilemma. However, part of my problem is making the school district the enforcer of such a provision in the sense that they not only are extending the enforcements beyond what they are now but they're including the punitive aspects of withholding state aid, withholding it on the assumption that 80% immunization is adequate immunization for all kids. And I'm guess that that means 80.... each child must be immunized 80% or that 80% of the children in the building are immunized. The fact is, again, that there is a difficulty with that. A child immunized at 80% still has a 20% contagion rate which could create problems in the school. I'm not so sure that without a 100% requirement, that we are going to



adequately solve the problem of the fears of spreading various contagious diseases. So it's kind of a quandry , I think. Members are going to have to make a decision about whether or not they want to...whether or not they feel that the schools with this program could adequately compel parents to immunize their children and school districts to enforce it. The other factor, I guess, Pete, is that...Pete, am I right in assuming that ESR will collect the money? Peters. Question now, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman..."

Schneider: "Pete..."

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

Schneider: "Is the ESR collecting the money now that they would be penalized? Will they collect the money? The school is not in compliance, they are penalized. Who holds the money?"

Peters: "The money will be held, as my understanding, by the Illinois Office of Education until such time as the school district comes into conformance. As you know, Representative Schneider, initially as the Bill was read, we called for 90% conformance in October of this year. And that was based, frankly, on information that was presented by the various school districts. In a rehash of all of that material and statistical information, it was determined that the schools districts of the state could in no way reach the requirement we were setting. So it was determined then that we should do this in a two tier kind of operation. One which says 80% of the children to be immunized by 1980, 90% by 1981. And once the immunization goals are reached, any monies, at any time that may have been withheld from the district would be returned. Now it is impossible to get 100% of the children immunized because you have to take into



account the other provisions of the law which allow some children not to be immunized because of their personal or their religious beliefs."

Schneider: "Well, in my final...thank you very much. Just in my final observation, schools were presently trying to deal with deal with over and under payments...school districts would be again...have money held from their budget...or withheld from their budget in anticipation with compliance of some kind of program. I think the effort is admirable. I frankly, as I stated earlier, see myself as being in a dilemma on the question of whether or not we ought to have school enforcement. I think we probably should try to find a way to resolve it. I'm going to vote 'no' but it's only because it's a difficult thing for me to see schools becoming the enforcer at a rate of 10% of school state aid on the basis of the failure to have kids immunized at the various percentages that the Sponsor has stated. I think it's a good effort. I have trouble supporting it, therefore, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the.. looking at the last paragraph of the Senate Amendment #2, I find that it's probably discriminatory and in violation of the civil rights. Are you aware that it says that it provides for withholding 10% of each state aid payment to school districts with the number of students in compliance below 80% of the enrollment on October 15th. There are an awful lot of religions that don't allow immunizations or any kind of shots. Wouldn't that prohibit ...wouldn't that be in violation of their rights?"

Peters: "No, Representative Conti. In the Bill itself, that objection was addressed in the House Human Resources Committee and that was amended in the House to exclude



those children whose parents objected to immunization or other kinds of medical treatment for religious reasons."

Conti: "Well now that becomes Class Legislation then."

Peters: "Representative, yes, a pretty good Class maybe."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hallstrom. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have introduced...planned to introduce a similar kind of Bill...and the Representative who is sponsoring this legislation and I work together. My approach was...I was concerned about the pre-school handicapped children. I was asked by the Illinois Office of Education to introduce this legislation. I think it's good legislation. I understand some of the concerns that people have mentioned, but the most important thing is it's added protection for small children, the same as we protect children from kindergarten on up. I would ask, please, that you support this Bill in the interest of children. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters to close."

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just to close. I can understand the concerns of...of some people in regard to the effect it might have on school districts but I think we've also got a higher kind of concern here. For a number of years I think our system and our society, as a whole, has taken for granted...health. And parents really have not brought their children to doctors, to the County Health Departments, the Public Health Departments to have them immunized. We know that in Pennsylvania and in Iowa you've had outbreaks of Polio. Polio is a disease that most of us thought was all totally manageable and it wouldn't breakout. The incidence of measles is on the increase, almost doubling every year in the State of Illinois. Measles,



if not cared for properly, ends up leading to, possibly in some children, to retardation, to sterility, to a number of other kinds of difficulties. It seems to us as a preventive measure, House Bill 2301 attacks the problem early when children can be immunized, when children can be protected against the diseases. It has the approval of the Illinois Office of Education. We have worked closely with this with the City of Chicago Department of Health and the schools there and they indicate to us that the Bill as...in the shape it is in now, is manageable and does not put an undue burden on them. I sincerely solicit your 'aye' vote on House Bill 2301 and concurrence in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the concurrence of Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to...that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2301. 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 question there are 135 voting 'aye' and 17 voting 'nay'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2301. Representative Matijevec, for what purpose do you arise?" Let the Clerk make an announcement here first and then I'll recognize you, Representative Matijevec."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 has now been distributed."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Matijevec, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've had a few Members come to me because of my Chairmanship of Appropriation I Committee and ask me what happening to the Department of Conservation's



budget. Earlier this morning the Majority Leader made the announcement that any Bill that is inclined to go into a Conference Committee, we ought to make the appropriate motions to set that Conference Committee in motion. I have reason to believe that House Bill 1657 will end up in a Conference Committee, yet it's been taken out of the record once. And I also have been told by some that some of the delay has little to do with the merits of the legislation. I stand here because it is a Bill that the Appropriations Committee tore into because of some questionable contracts in the youth...the Young Adult Conservation Corps which has been restored in the Senate. And I think it's going to end up in the Conference Committee and I'm urging the House Sponsor of that Bill, House Bill 1657, to do what she should to put that Bill in the posture of going to the Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I share that point of view. I have a couple of Bills remaining that are not as controversial as a budget. I've been here long enough now to know that we push those budgets up to the end of the hour and then other deals are struck. I take exception to people pulling out appropriation Bills that are not controversial, that both sides have resolved their differences on and delaying us. I have substantive legislation, I don't want to lose it because somebody is playing games with that appropriation budget that's already worked out. So I share what Mr. Matijevich is pointing out. I noticed that conservation went today. It went out yesterday. There's something going on. I think it ought to be taken out and clarified or heard. So let's get some action on that so that we can move on with our own Member Bills and



not worry about those later on in Appropriations."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support Mr. Matijevich's remarks as well. I am too concerned about the Department of Conservation's budget. I think there are substantive issues in that budget. For example, there is money that is at stake for...for freeing of federal money for urban parks, recovery and recreational programs. There are issues having to do with the Rock Island Trail. I think there is going to be a lot of discussion and debate over that budget and I would hope that we would be able to deal with it soon and not tie up the work of this House."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I too stand in support of Representative Matijevich. And to add to the things that have been talked about here, I understand that the bone of contention with which the budget is being held is completely unrelated to the budget or any item in that budget. It happens to relate to a very controversial matter that is now in litigation. And I think that is the most terrible thing we could do with a budget like that and I would urge the Sponsor to move that budget along."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't know what can be done about it. I... Representative Hoxsey, do you wish to call 1657? Out of the record. On page 10, under Conference Committee Reports, appears Senate Bill 1325, Representative Dwight Friedrich. Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate did not concur in the House Amendment because of a staff report that was improperly written. When I talked to the Senate Sponsor he admitted that it should have been left on. All the Conference Committee did was put that House Amendment back on which left it in the same condition



it left the House. As far as I know there's no controversy but I would be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I very much dislike doing this but the only copy that I have on my desk does not have the names of the confereees typed under it. Is there any new Conference Report that corrects that flaw?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "No, there is not another but I'd be glad to retype the names if it would help you. This is the first Conference Committee...came back and...the Senate does not have that in their rules and they typed up the Conference Committee Report."

Vinson: "Representative Friedrich, I regret having to do this but we've said repeatedly here in this afternoon that we're going to do it and I think we have to stick to the rules."

Friedrich: "I think there's been an exception and I think this was done before the protest was made. If... for your edification, I'd be glad to retype them for you and then you'll know who they are anyway. Harry Leinenweber is the most difficult to read...he's number two on the right. I told him he should have been a doctor."

Speaker Flinn: "We have a problem with my statement earlier. We stated that the Clerk's well would not accept those that weren't typed. Our problem is we cannot dictate to the Senate to type theirs and they say that's not their practice and they don't intend to start it."

Vinson: "What about where the House Members are typed?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we can..we can enforce that portion of it."

Friedrich: "If you want to go to the expense of having this



printed over, Representative Vinson, I'll be happy to accommodate you. But if you want to know who the Members are, I'll be glad to recite them to you."

Vinson: "Dwight, I have to insist on the rule."

Friedrich: "Well, I hope that you will not complain about the expenses of the Legislature then because this is going to take two hundred copies and...and we'll note that you caused us to have that expense."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, since our rule does say..."

Friedrich: "I'll be glad to help you sometime, too."

Pullen: "...that the names must be typed on Conference Committee Reports, I'm wondering whether it might be possible for a Committee Report that comes from the Senate without the names being typed to have the names typed on it before it is printed and distributed so that we can act in compliance with our rules."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich, in spite of the fact that I agree...that I agree with you, it will cost a lot of money to reprint this. The rule says that if they insist on enforcing ^{the} / rules, the rule says..."

Friedrich: "Mr. Chairman, I move to suspend the rule with respect to this one Bill...this is one Conference Committee Report. If you want to go to the expense of having it printed, I have no objection. I do..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the appropriate rule to accept this one Report without the names being type written. Any objections? No object...Representative...Representative Piel."

Piel: "Yeah, a question."

Speaker Flinn: "Question, state..."

Piel: "Are you talking about the staff analysis report..."

Speaker Flinn: "1325. Senate Bill 1325 is not properly... does not properly have the names typed on it. Repre-



sentative Pullen do you object?"

Friedrich: "I have made a motion. We're on the motion."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I'm trying to get leave of the House to do it."

Pullen: "The rules say that this provision may be suspended by the vote of 107 Members and only by that. Since this is a new rule..."

Speaker Flinn: "Are you objecting..."

Pullen: "...and we want it to work, I think we ought to object and allow the Gentleman to put the motion to a Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Are you objecting to using unanimous consent?"

Pullen: "Yes I am."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. The Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate rule so that this Conference Committee Report can be heard in spite of the fact that it does not comply with the rules. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well I have to take exception to the Sponsor of this Bill in saying that my name is not legible. I looked at it and I could certainly tell it was my signature."

Speaker Flinn: "Well I knew it was you all the time."

Friedrich: "I apologize, Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bob Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the Gentleman that made the motion also include House Bill 112? I got that in there..."

Speaker Flinn: "No. We're already on the board with this one motion. You'll have to do it separately."

Piel: "It's not mine, I don't care."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. 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 12 voting 'nay'. And the motion carries and we will hear ...the rule is suspended. We will hear Senate Bill 1325. Any further discussion, Representative Friedrich?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just say again, this merely puts back the Amendment that was put on in the House and the Bill...as the...the Conference Committee now makes the Bill exactly as it left the House, Representative."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? The question is, shall the House adopt Senate...Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill...Senate and House Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1325? 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 144 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'nay'. And the House does accept the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1325. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. All on the same page, page 10, is Senate Bill 1423, Representative Hoffman. Gene Hoffman is recognized for a motion. 1423."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1423, a Bill sponsored by Senator Weaver in the Senate and myself in the House, concerns the transfer of tax from townships to counties for convalescent homes. While it was in the House we amended it to give the Chairman of the County Board in DuPage County and St. Clair County, kind of quasi-veto powers, over decisions of the Board. I would move at this time, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1423."



Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? If not, the Gentleman has moved that the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1423. All those 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 138 voting 'aye' and 0 voting 'nay'. And the House does recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1423. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 7 appears House Bill 2167. Representative Bullock is recognized for the purpose of a motion. The TV lights are on and that doesn't...I don't make that statement to encourage you to make long speeches but...you will anyway... everybody will."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 2167. This Amendment, in effect, codifies an existing National Labor Relations Board action regarding a collective bargaining agreement. I'd be glad to answer any questions and I certainly would move for concurrence."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a few questions."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Leinenweber: "As I read the synopsis, the Bill started out authorizing a hearing officer to order reinstatement and back pay for a period of not more than two years prior to filing of charges. Then House Amendment #1 apparently got into maternity and child care in relation to unfair labor...unfair employment practices."

Bullock: "Yeah, this is it."

Leinenweber: "Is that the case?"

Bullock: "Yes it is, Representative Leinenweber. It passed the House overwhelmingly 133 to 6. It passed the



Senate overwhelmingly bipartisan support each time. You're absolutely correct, it did include the clause on maternity leave and child care."

Leinenweber: "All right, now, what does the Senate Amendment do then?"

Bullock: "Senate Amendment #3 codifies an existing National Labor Relations Board decision of 77 which, in effect, says that there's successor clause regarding collective bargaining agreements. And that is that the successor shall keep in tact that agreement."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear the Gentleman. There's seems to be a high level of noise."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Just one moment, please. Let's try to cut the noise level down so the questioner and the person answering the question can be heard. Proceed, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, the Gentleman was explaining the Senate Amendment and I couldn't hear what he was saying."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bullock, would you repeat it, please?"

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Amendment #3, basically, codifies the National Labor Relations Board's decision regarding successor employees. As a general proposition, a successor employer hires a majority of employees from a corporation and if the title or the ownership of that corporation were to change, the collective bargaining agreement would, in fact, remain intact. That's the estimation of Senate Amendment #3."

Leinenweber: "It codifies a National Labor Relation Board decision?"

Bullock: "That is correct, yes, Sir."

Leinenweber: "Was that overturned by the Supreme Court?"

Bullock: "To my knowledge, Representative Leinenweber, the decision was by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in '77"



and the National Labor Relations Board's decision was in '72. So I think the two are..."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly on Senate Amendment #1.

It adds language contained from Senate Bill 556, which was defeated in the Senate. The Amendment requires anyone who acquires a business or industry to honor the terms and conditions of any existing collective bargaining contract for that business or industry. This concept requiring the employer to honor the existing contract was given a Supreme Court test in the Burns International Security Services versus NLRB's case which Supreme Court Justice White upheld that the detective agency was not bound by the substantive provisions of the prior contractor's collective bargaining agreement. So it would appear that the Senate Amendment seeks to, in the words of Representative Katz, once again, give a third, fourth or a fifth life to a dead cat. It seeks to turn around a Supreme Court decision which reversed a National Labor Relations Board's decision. I'm ^{not} sure that a concurrence...or an Amendment after a Bill is defeated is the proper vehicle. It would seem that we ought to nonconcur in this Amendment. Send it back to the Senate for recession and let them make a decision as to whether or not they want the Bill as originally...as it left the House which did contain some provisions for maternity care and child care. I don't think that we ought to, in the waning hours of the Session in a concurrence, adopt language in a Bill which was defeated which, in effect, overturns a Supreme Court decision. So I would urge a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask the Members of the House to



pay very close attention to House Bill 2167. The Sponsor of the Bill stated that it passed overwhelmingly. Well, I have the feeling that this Bill passed overwhelmingly because we didn't realize the ramifications ^{what} of the Bill entailed in the initial stages. Just to give you a little bit of an idea, let's take a small business that has a bookkeeper. It's a vital part of this business. They have to keep that job for that bookkeeper open for six months if she is on maternity leave. You look at some of these small businesses and there is no way that they can keep this job open. You take a position in another type of a business to where it is a very specialized type of a job, to where this job has to be filled, this persons comes back and they have to get the same job back. Now what does the Senate Amendment do? Like Representative Bullock stated a minute ago, the Senate Amendment... you will also buy..if you are buying a business, you will buy the labor contract that goes along. It's not that at face value but look at what would happen if I bought your business and I was going to use it for a different purpose. I have to buy the labor contract that goes along with it. Now I might not even be buying the business for that purpose but I have to buy the labor contracts that go. I've heard both sides of talking that their very pro-business, well this is a very, very anti-small business Bill. And I would ask that you would not concur with House Bill 2167."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape. Wait a minute, just one moment. Representative Simms, state your point."

Simms: "My point of order is dealing with Senate Amendment #1 of the Parliamentarian, whether the Amendment is a correct Amendment to the Bill that is before the House.



I think there is a technical error in the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Teddy said yes."

Simms: "I would like the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Will the Parliamentarian..."

Simms: "With all respect to the Assistant Majority Leader."

Speaker Flinn: "Parliamentarian, come to the podium, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, do you want to restate your point?"

Simms: "Well, my point is that our staff person is checking with the Parliamentarian on the possibility of errors in the Amendment which, in fact, contradicts the... the legislation as amended."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Amendment is in order according to the Parliamentarian. Any further discussion? But according to the Parliamentarian it would affect the Bill, they may want to put it in a Conference Committee. It puts the Bill out of order. It creates an inconsistency within the Bill. No, it's not. Mr. Simms, it creates an inconsistency within the Bill."

Simms: "Could I be recognized to speak on the merits of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, then? I would just like to reiterate the points that Representative Leinenweber so clearly illustrated. That frankly, this is in contradiction to the United States Supreme Court test in 1972 in the case of Burns International Security Services versus the National Labor Relations Board. Very frankly, this is in contradiction to the United States Supreme Court decision as been illustrated by Representative Leinenweber and also illustrated by Representative Piel. I think what we should be very careful of also is the second...the Amendment #3 which deals with child care. There are problems within the Amendment. There is inconsistency which would, without question, cause court litigation. And without going into many other reasons of the poor



aspects of the Bill, I would suggest that the House nonconcur and return this to a Conference Committee Report and straighten out a piece of legislation that is going to be on the question of a court test dealing with the errors in the Senate Amendment. And I would urge a nonconcurrency."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I question the germaneness of the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am, would you bring a copy of the Bill up? According to the Parliamentarian the Amendment is germane. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Schuneman: "Representative Bullock, is there any exclusion in this Bill for the small employers? In other words, does it apply to all employers or only those with employees over ten or some such number?"

Bullock: "Well, this Bill, Representative Schuneman, applies with to employers / one hundred employees or more. And most specifically, if the employer, Representative Schuneman, chose not to hire but maybe forty-eight percent of the existing employees, this would not apply."

Schuneman: "I beg your pardon, I didn't hear last statement."

Bullock: "I said the predicament would be, and the courts held, that if that very small business employer chose to hire less than, say forty-eight percent, of the existing employees it would not apply anyway. The court decision upheld that."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the Bill. I..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Schuneman: "I think that the...the idea behind the Bill perhaps is laudable but I do believe that this will create a real problem for some small business in Illinois. If a large/^{business} is mandated to hold a position open, then they have fifty or one hundred people that do that same function and it would be much easier for them to move people around than keep a position open for something like a year as mandated in this Bill. But when you're talking about small employers, and especially for key positions such as Representative Piel point out, those of a bookkeeper or something of that sort, it would be very difficult for small employers to comply with this Bill. And I think we're passing along, if we adopt this Bill, we're passing along one more problem for small businesses in the State of Illinois and I really think the Bill should be rejected in its present state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, to close."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me just say that the issue has been raised of the constitutionality of 2167 and that is far from the truth. The general proposition is only half true. When a successor employer, a small business otherwise, hires a majority of its predecessor's employers and preserves intact the operational and organizational structure of that existing business, the Supreme Court/^{has} held and the National Labor Relations Board have held that this is not sufficient to relieve



the successive obligation. This is a good Bill. It's both a good Bill for big business, it's a good Bill for small business, it's a good Bill for labor and I certainly would urge the House to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill...Senate Bill...to House Bill 2167."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2167? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Dewitt, Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Well, I conferred with the Parliamentarian, who I believe is prepared to admit that his ruling was incorrect. And I wish the Gentleman who is sponsoring this Bill would take it out of the record to give us a chance, to ^{give} the Parliamentarian the chance, to fully review that question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Vinson, I believe that the Parliamentarian was here when you raised your question. He told me it was germane..."

Vinson: "He didn't even have a copy of the Bill to look at."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't know about any conversations you've had with him since then..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well ask him, he's standing right there, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? You'll have it. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Parliamentarian says that it's close enough. On this question there's 101 'ayes', 60 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Brummer: "Yes, I accidentally pushed the wrong switch. Could you vote me 'no', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Kindly record Mr. Brummer as



'no'. On this question there's 100 'ayes', 61 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2167. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...Mr. Simms wants a verification, he's entitled to it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, these bright lights have been on quite a long time, could we lower it down please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Kindly stop filming, Sir. Would you kindly stop filming? Thank you very much. I did. I did. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madigan: "Please verify me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce. Your light is on. Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, wants a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Daniels. Goodwin."

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

Younge: "Verify."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave to be verified? Leave granted."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue."

Clerk Leone: "Grossi. Hoxsey. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Oblinger. Satterthwaite. Schlickman and Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yourell wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Kelly as 'aye'. Mrs. Satterthwaite as 'aye'. Mrs. Willer. Kindly put Mrs. Willer on."

Willer: "Just change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mrs. Willer to 'aye'. Do you still persist? What's the count? Donovan as 'aye'. Mr. Meyer as 'aye'. The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. Thank you. What's the



count, Tony? How much? On this question there are 105 'ayes', 60 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2167. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar on page 4 is House Bill 822. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 822."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 822? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Yes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'ayes', 5 'noes', 0 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 822. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 884. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to concur on House Bill 884. House...the Amendment #1 is the repealer that Jake Wolf asked me to put on. I put that on in the Senate, it repeals it. And the second Amendment is the...putting on the Ethnic Heritage Commission. And I move to concur with both Amendments. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Did I hear the Gentleman right, we now, in addition to having the Commission on Labor and Management Relations, we're now also having another Ethnic Heritage Festival Commission."

Capparelli: "Harry, yes, but it was passed last year. The House failed to name any Commission Members and the



money is still there and they're just going to renew it. That's all."

Leinenweber: "Well, I'm talking about the Ethnic Heritage..."

Capparelli: "That's what I'm talking about."

Leinenweber: "Well we just sent that to the Governor the other day..."

Capparelli: "On...on Mugalian's Bill."

Leinenweber: "How many of these are we going to send him?"

Capparelli: "Well, I guess we'll...at least two of them.

But he could take it out of this one, I don't care.

I just don't want it to go back into another Conference Committee. So I'll move to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman...the question is, shall the House...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well the Gentleman from Will was correct, this is not the second time, it's the third time. This thing is also on...excuse me... House Bill 2004. And we almost beat this thing the other night and I would suggest that either the Gentleman from Cook nonconcur or that we beat 884 as it is."

Capparelli: "Mr. Totten, it's getting late in the Session here and if we go back to a Conference Committee we may never get back to it. I'm sure the Governor will strike it from one of the Bills, and I hope it's from mine. But Roger McAuliffe and I would like to get our Commission Bill out of here and I would ask you to please adopt the Amendments 1 and 2."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would be delighted to have Representative Capparelli have this on his Bill. I think we should put them on as many Bills as possible so that maybe mine won't have it on it."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 884. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, I was just going to ask the Sponsor some questions on this Commission if...if he'll yield. A little late for that, I understand, but at the same time, I had my light on. Cap, could you tell me, is this the...is this the same Commission that used to be the Labor Laws Commission?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Capparelli, please."

Capparelli: "Yeah, turn me on. I beg your pardon, Tuerk."

Tuerk: "The original Bill, Labor and Management Relations Commission, is that the successor of the Labor Laws Commission?"

Capparelli: "No. This is a Bill that is sponsored by eighty some Cosponsors of the House. And Jake Wolf voted for it and asked me put a repealer on it and I promised I would."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand that. I just wanted to know whether this is..."

Capparelli: "No, it's not."

Tuerk: "Another Commission in addition to the Labor Laws Commission?"

Capparelli: "I don't...I don't..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That was me. Put him on, Capparelli."

Capparelli: "I don't know of another Commission."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'ayes', 44 'nays', 0 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, wants to verify. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Record me 'aye'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'. Wait, let the Clerk get his sheet first. Schneider 'aye'. Dyer 'aye'. Robbins 'aye'. Hudson 'no'. Kindly record Kelly as 'aye'...switch him from 'no' to 'aye'. What are we starting with? Mr. Huskey. Record Mr. Huskey as 'no'. Neff 'no'. McBroom 'aye'. McBroom 'aye'. Grossi as 'aye'. Okay. What's our count, Mr. Clerk? Mulcahey as 'aye'. Pretty close, do you want to withdraw your...it's very dilatory, they're all here. If you want you can come up here, Don, and take a look. You can take a look, Bus. There are 110 'aye', 56 'noes'. They're all here. On this question...and the House does concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Would you poll the absentees?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Brummer. Catania. Daniels. Davis. Ralph Dunn. Friedland. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Emil Jones. Klosak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, for what purpose do you seek recognition? To be verified? Leave to be verified, Getty. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mrs. Catania as 'aye'. That's 112 or 13, I believe. Jones, Emil Jones. Mr. Deuster 'aye'. Brummer as 'aye'. Friedland as 'aye'. Mrs. Younge as 'aye'. We're going to go in a minute. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 116 'aye', 45 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 884. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 700. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 700. The effect of the Amendments are as follows: Amendment #1 provides, with regard to the tax sheltering provisions in the Bill, that an employer, in this case a State



University System, could elect either to escrow the amounts of money picked up as employee contributions until they have an affirmative ruling or otherwise from either a federal court or the Internal Revenue Service or they could elect to continue their current posture of withholding from employees until such time as that occurs one way or the other. Amendment #2 places in the Bill an effective date consistent beginning with the next tax year. I move concurrence in the two Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 in House Bill 700? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'ayes', 7 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 in House Bill 700. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2012. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2012 is the same Bill as House Bill 700, which deals with the tax deferment on retirement benefits. I move that we concur with the Senate Amendments which are basically technical Amendments cleaning up the Bill. Senate Amendment #1 is the same which provides that an escrow fund be established until approval by the I.R.S. Senate Amendment #2 makes the effective date January 1, 1980, the same as 700, to coincide with the new tax year. Senate Amendment #3 makes a correction with regard to salaries dealing with the Chicago Park and Retirement Board employees annuity fund. Amendment #4 clarifies that the contribution made on behalf of the participant provides that refunds are those solely deemed as contributions made by the participant.



Amendment #5 reiterates the effective date of January 1, throughout the balance of the Bill. Amendment #6, again, provides that the city pick up the employees contribution required under the Section for the Municipal Retirement Fund. Senate Amendment #7 amends the Teachers Retirement Article since a number of teachers are already covered under the provision provided in ^{Senate Bill} /700. And Amendment #8 provides that the system for the Chicago Metropolitan area be on a voluntary basis. And I move that we concur with the Senate Amendments."

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

Bluthardt: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "I'm a little bit concerned and confused about what you mean by the employer...let's take Senate Amendment #6 and the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund. The employer is to pick up the employees contributions of this Section. Now are we talking about the...the pension benefits,..the difference in the pension benefits?"

Terzich: "No, no, all this...there's no difference in the pension benefits. All this simply stipulates is that the monies that are contributed on behalf of the employee, which is his employee deductions for the income tax purposes, are considered as employer contributions for income tax purposes. There's no change in the pension system, in the addition or decrease of any unfunded liability or anything of this nature."

Bluthardt: "Well, let's say that the employee, at the time of his retirement, owes the fund some money...owes the employer some money, a village or some municipality. Would that not be deducted from his pension benefits?"

Terzich: "The Bill has nothing to do with that since the



pension benefits, number one, could not be diminished. You couldn't guaran...take any money out of an employee's pension benefits. You couldn't guarantee...he couldn't owe any money to the municipality that you could deduct from his pension benefits."

Bluthardt: "Well, I think the Bill refers the deduction from the salary...future salaries for...I suppose, that's because there...there is some difference, in the beginning at least, that... What you're trying to do, as I understand it, is that instead of having the salary of an employee taxed at the full amount, that you reduce the amount to be taxed, both by the State and Federal Government, to his salary after his contribution has been deducted. Is that correct?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Bluthardt: "And conceivably...why else would you have the language in the Bill that the employee will pay the difference and deduct it from the salary of future earnings? Why would you have that provision unless conceivably the...the employee would be owing some money to the municipality?"

Terzich: "I'm sorry, Representative Bluthardt, could you repeat that because there's a lot of noise in here..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Could we kindly give the Gentleman some order?"

Bluthardt: "Well, the whole provision about deductions from future earnings of an employer...employee, bothers me. If...if there's that provision, then apparently, you'll anticipate that there are cases where an employee would be owing to the municipality...with some of the monies that have been paid by the employer. And that when he leaves he might still be indebted to the employer, and that I suppose would come out of his pension benefits. Is that correct?"

Terzich: "The...all right, the wording in there is to satisfy the



Internal Revenue Service to get the exemption under the I.R.S., Provision 41 4H of the Internal Revenue Code. And that's the reason that the language is in there. That...again, there is no indebtedness to the municipality whatsoever."

Bluthardt: "Then, again I say, I don't understand why the language is in there about deducting from future earnings of the employee."

Terzich: "Well, that's the way the Internal Revenue said that it has to stated to ^{be} qualify for the exemption."

Bluthardt: "Okay, thank you."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on all of the Amendments, and they are technical, as a hyphenated principal Sponsor of the Bill, to make it clear once and for all. There is no windfall to anyone. The Amendments merely stipulate that any employee could not pick up any part of a refund that was either not his initial contribution before this Bill would take effect or he or she could pick up no more in additional refunds than were contributed by a pick up, which would have been his contribution or hers had this Bill not been in effect. There would be a discount in salary which would give a tax shelter. That's what the Amendments do. But for pension purposes, and I want to make this crystal clear, the Amendments provide, as did the Bill, that for pension purposes the employee would have no reduction in the base salary. That salary would be, as Representative Wolf just asked me on the side over here, that pension salary would be for pension purposes the base plus the amount picked up which would have been the original salary. This has been consistent with provisions with laws in other states that are already in force and already agreed to by the Federal courts in California and Wisconsin. And I would urge,



as Representative Terzich did, concurrence in each of these Senate Amendments because they do merely clarify what is in the Bill as it passed the House."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Mahar: "Why are the forest preserve districts exempt from this when Cities and Villages and all other units are in it?"

Terzich: "The Bill is optional on the part of the...the municipalities. In other words, the whole thing is optional on the part of the...by Amendment #8, that makes it optional on each municipality. If they want to apply for it they can."

Mahar: "But why would forest preserve districts be out of it? They have employees and the same situation applies to them."

Terzich: "I understand that they are covered under the Cook County Article, the reason they've been removed."

Mahar: "They're covered someplace else?"

Terzich: "That's correct..."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Terzich: "...under the Cook County Article 9."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "On your escrow account..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You'll have to speak up, Sir."

Robbins: "On the escrow account, is there an interest requirement on it?"

Terzich: "There's no need for an interest to be paid. All it simply states is that that money would be held in escrow until approved by the I.R.S. for income tax purposes."

Robbins: "You...you mean that the employees' money is going to lay there for as much as ten months out of the year



in an escrow account...before they draw any interest on it?"

Terzich: "Number one, is that the money would be held anyhow, regardless of this Bill was in effect or not. It would be deducted and withheld regardless. Number two, that the money is going to be withheld subject to the approval by the I.R.S., which could be one month or two months or three months."

Robbins: "You can't get daily interest?"

Terzich: "Well, if you can get the interest, you can go and get it. What I'm telling you, the money is going to be deducted."

Robbins: "Okay."

Terzich: "You wouldn't get the money anyhow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 on House Bill 2012? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'ayes', 20 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 on House Bill 2012. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. It's been requested of the Chair to make an announcement that...to ask all unauthorized personnel to remove themselves from the floor. All unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor. House Bill 753. The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 753. What the Amendment does is changes some wording. It's a technical Amendment from violation of the Election Code...changes to violation of the Election Code from felony. The original Bill...this was a



companion Bill to a...755 which did not get out of the House. It was caught up in the crunch Friday night. So we have to change the language in it to make it comply."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 753? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Darrow: "I had a question about this for the Sponsor. I just glanced at this, I didn't have time to go over it. I was wondering if, for example, you weren't home and your wife signed your name to some sort of nomination petition, if she would be guilty of a violation of the Election Code. I just don't the ramifications of this, and I until I do I'm going to vote 'present'."

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

Getty: "I know we've already taken the Roll, but I wonder... an explanation of his vote, the Gentleman could explain if the legislative intent here is that the signature be a knowing signature, as is contained in the other parts of the Bill?"

Watson: "Yes."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'ayes', 0 'nays', 17 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 753. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1211. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz."



Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 in House Bill 1211."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the motion to concur. I think that this is a good change which does not in any way minimize the effect of the Bill. I think it's a good concurrence and I urge support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, what does it do? Mr. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "It requires the companies to maintain a file of its quarterly inspection report. The Bill originally required the companies to file these reports with the Illinois Commerce Commission monthly. It also requires that the Illinois Commerce Commission...to audit the company's report annually. And failure to refer to malfunctioning equipment would, / ^{within} twelve hours...is made a business offense and punishable by a fine of two hundred and fifty dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1211. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'ayes', 17 'nays', 0 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1211. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2500. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2500. It restores provisions of Section 12 which were...which are presently in the law relating to attorney's fees. And I would ask for concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2500."

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

Totten: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

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

Totten: "Representative Marovitz, my...my analysis shows there's two Senate Amendments on this, is that correct?"

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Totten: "You didn't explain Senate Amendment #2."

Marovitz: "Well, are we going to...take them at the same time? Alright. Senate Amendment #2...there was inadvertently in the drafting of the legislation the present provisions of the law which relate to Christian Scientists were deleted and this just puts the present provisions of the law relating to Christian Scientists nursing care back into the law and no...no additional language whatsoever. I'm asking for concurrence of Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2500."

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

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I have...I have some questions, too."

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

Leinenweber: "Senate Amendment #1...you sounded like you said the Amendment does absolutely nothing. Would you clarify...it wouldn't surprise me, it's a Senate Amendment, but...what does Amendment #1 do?"

Marovitz: "Amendment...Senate Amendment #1 puts the status... puts the law in the present status of the law regarding attorney's fees. That is that attorney's fees cannot be



charged for the mere filing of notice of intent, but if ...if an attorney represents a client at a hearing, attorney's fees may be awarded by the Court of Claims. That is the present law as it is today."

Leinenweber: "Alright, the Bill as it left the House then it made some change in the present law in regard to attorney's fees?"

Marovitz: "The Bill as it left the House struck the entire Section relating to attorney's fees, completely. Which would mean then, since there was no mention at all, that attorney's fees could be charged for any action whatsoever up to any amount to be determined by an attorney. And that is totally contrary to the present law and to spirit of Crime-Victim Compensation Act."

Leinenweber: "Alright. Now, in the Bill itself, Amendments ...House Amendments #4...let's see...number 9 added... what...deleted a provision which prohibited a victim from claiming compensation when the assailant was residing in the same household, is that correct?"

Marovitz: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "And...what was the purpose of that?"

Marovitz: "Well, we had a battered spouse Amendment in here which^{was} added in the House and we made provisions so that if a battered spouse was going to be allowed compensation, they would not be able to be residing at the time the notice was filed or the award was made. So that people that were living together would not be able to...if they chose to continue to live together...if they wanted to live together in a situation like that, they shouldn't look to the state for compensation."

Leinenweber: "Alright, so the requirement..."

Marovitz: "That is not one of the two..."

Leinenweber: "I know but..."

Marovitz: "That is not one of the two that we're trying to concur."



Leinenweber: "I know but we're going to be voting on this Bill and I just want to make sure everybody knows this Bill would allow the so-called battered spouse or a cohabitee from making a...would make a claim against the state for injuries received from the person that he or she was residing with provided that at both the time that they filed the claim and at the time the claim is awarded, they are not residing together. Is that right?"

Marovitz: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "And does the Bill require that that failure... that the nonresiding together continue...be continuous from the time of the claim until the award. In other words, does it just require them the two days, one when they award and one when the claim is filed, they don't have to reside together. Or must the...must it be continuous?"

Marovitz: "I don't think the Bill speaks to that in specific."

Leinenweber: "Well, would it be possible under this Bill for a battered person who is battered by someone that they are residing with, to merely move out the day before the award in order to qualify?"

Marovitz: "No, I think the intent of the legislation is clear."

Leinenweber: "Well, I'm not talking about the intent. What does it say?"

Marovitz: "Well, you have the Amendment in front of you."

Leinenweber: "No I don't unfortunately."

Marovitz: "Well, I don't have it in front of me either. I think I answered the question that the..."

Leinenweber: "I wonder if you could take it out of the record until you take a look at the Amendment?"

Marovitz: "Well...you know, it's the day before, I'd like to go ahead with this legislation."

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

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I do have some knowledge of law enforcement and it seems



though to me that the very people on both sides of the aisle that is talking about restraints, talking about people being on welfare, talking helping the poor. I'd like to bring your attention to a couple of matters that have happened recently where a victim of a crime was unable to return/work. He had to join welfare. A victim of a crime...he lost his job, his family suffered. Now I agree that maybe the Bill...2500 does not address all of the things, but certainly it's a step in the right direction. Why is it that we always want to protect the criminals? Why do we always want to give him his rights? Well what about the victims? What about the citizens? What about the people that work every day? What about the church abiding citizens? You know, this House is beginning to remind me of myself at home. My Mother calls me 'boy', and my son calls me 'old man'. Well let's make up our mind. What are we all about? Are we going to start protecting the citizens of the State of Illinois or are we going to continue to look out for the criminals? And I suggest that 2500, under the Sponsorship of Billy Marovitz, continue and let's vote this Bill out. Thank you."

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

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm almost afraid to rise in behalf of this Bill because very seldom do I have a Bill I can agree with Representative Marovitz on. But this is a good Bill. I have personal knowledge of the way the operation is run. The girl who runs the program for the Attorney General, her father used to be a policeman and I went to school with her brother. I've been up to her office, I've seen how they run the program. She's been very cooperative with the Chicago Police Department. We put a tape out together and it was played in all the police stations in Chicago that explained to the policemen the benefits



of this Bill and how they could help people who were victims of violent crimes. While I am very much in favor of law and order Bills, this is a Bill that would help the victims of crimes and I am strongly in favor of it."

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

Johnson: "Well, Bill, I'm disappointed that you are moving to concur with Amendment #2. Because you agreed in Committee and on the floor to accept my Amendment striking reference in Section 19 and now you're moving to concur with the Senate Amendment that does precisely the opposite of that. And you're...and when you say that it states...that it restates the existing law, it doesn't at all. Section 19 is completely new language. If you'll look at Section 12 of House Bill 2500, it's completely new language. Everybody agreed in Committee and on the floor that that Amendment was a proper Amendment and now you're moving to concur. I really don't understand that, it really disappoints me. I thought I had a pledge from you that if..that if I agreed to support you in Committee that you were going to...you were going to perpetuate in that...persist in striking reference to attorney fees. All we're doing by...by my Amendment, Amendment #6, is allowing a client and an attorney to negotiate their own agreement. We're not saying that there has to be X percentage charge or anything else. We're simply giving latitude to people to negotiate a contract for effective representation. And for that reason, even though I think the Bill overall is excellent and I supported it, in fact, I think I was the Cosponsor of it, I'm not going to...I'm not going to support your motion to concur because I think it's a breach of faith."

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



Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, in the words of that great philosopher, Robert Terzich, Amen, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed... the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ought to clarify the previous Speaker Amendment #2 is Christian Scientist Amendment. We are...the move was to concur on both Amendments. Amendment #1 which deals with attorney's fees...I...never agreed to...to delete all reference to attorney's fees and only through inadvertance were all reference to attorney's fees deleted. What I had intended to do and I hope Mr. Johnson understands he had two Amendments, one was to delete all references to attorney's fees and one was to make attorney's fees 33 1/3% and all I agreed to do was to put the Bill back the way it is presently. So that for a simple filing of a notice, which anybody can do, all you have to put down is your name, your address and some very simple information, attorneys can't rip off the victims of crimes in those cases so that when they get an award, which is going to be small enough in emergencies...emergency situations in the first place, when they get an award, they can spend that award for the emergency expenses that they incurred and not have to pay an attorney for the mere filing of a notice. But when an attorney appears at a hearing and actually does some work for which they should be compensated, then the Court of Claims in its own wisdom can and should award attorney's fees ^{commensurate} / with the amount of work done by the attorney. And I would ask for concurrence on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2500."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2500? All in



favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Stearney: "Never mind, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'ayes', 20 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2500. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 512. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 512. All it does is take out township board of trustees for teachers if they are elected."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 512. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'ayes', 3 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 512. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 834. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Dyer. The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Amendments 1 through 6...Senate Amendments 1 through 6 to House Bill 834. You'll remember that this Bill is really a good government Bill. It's been worked on very hard by the staff and the Committee Members of both Parties in both Houses. The basic Bill dealt with ^afail-safe way of having absentee ballots counted...that prevents fraud. The Senate Amendments do several things. One, provides



for the maintenance of a suspense file for two years to prevent perfectly good voters, in good faith, from having their name removed the files without their knowledge. Senate Amendment #3 requires a minimum of three hundred signatures from Members of the General Assembly, the candidates for the General Assembly. Amendment #5 requires that election authorities must make their computer tapes available to authorized political committees and parties under certain protective conditions, misuse is a Class IV felony. Finally, it increases the number of signatures for independent candidates to assure that there will not be frivolous candidates running for the General Assembly. I think they're good Amendments. It's a good type star spangled, red, white and blue Bill and I certainly ask for your 'yes' vote."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill indicated that the original Bill involves a full-proof, fail-safe, fraudulent-proof method of counting absentee ballots. And I, personally, don't think that having the absentee ballots that come in on Election Day that are received too late to be delivered to the polls, counted in the County Clerk's Office is a full-proof, fail-safe, fraudulent-proof method of counting absentee ballots. And I'm opposed to this concurrence for the reason that I am opposed to the original Bill. This is not the solution for the absentee ballot problem, it's certainly not in Cook County. Maybe it is in the county where the Sponsor resides, but it is not in Cook County and I urge people not to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom. The question is, shall the House concur in Amendment...in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 834?"



All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'ayes', 25 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 834. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Lady...the Gentlemen who are filming up in the gallery, the TV lights are not on, would you...you have to ask permission in order to film. Would you shut off the lights? I don't care what they're doing. Shut them off. Thank you. We'll turn them on in a few minutes. House Bill 570. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 570."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There has been a request to put the TV camera lights on. Hearing no objection, you'll be able to film. Is there any discussion? Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. McAuliffe on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 570."

McAuliffe: "I move to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "They would like an explanation."

McAuliffe: "Senate Amendment #1 provides that the sheets be submitted in no more than one thousand bound together. You can't put fifty thousand sheets together and submit them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 570. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', 1 'nay', 6 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House



Bill 570. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2577. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk. Out of the record. House Bill 2298, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2298 provides that a county board must publish its rules and regulations for admission and discharge from a county home. And also to post those rules and regulations at the home and furnish copies upon request. It also deletes language involving rates for persons able to purchase their own care to approximate actual cost and substitutes a requirement that county home must charge by 1981 persons that are able to purchase their own care at a rate of not less than 91% of the actual cost. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2298 makes this Bill about the same as Senate Bill 492. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2298."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2298? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Oh, the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk. Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, yeah, unless you uncover that board up there, Mr. Speaker, and look back toward the back room, we're going to ask for a verification on some of these. I wanted to ask him a question, that's all, just pure and simple."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Tuerk: "How did you arrive, Mr. Yourell, at the 91%, that intrigues me?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, that was the figure that was suggested by the County Home Nursing Association and that's the language that's in Senate Bill 492."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Tuerk, do you have any more questions?"

Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'ayes', 4 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2298. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Chair has been informed that the Speaker intends to recess for one hour between the hour of eight and nine this evening so that ten Conference Committees that have been established can meet. That's between eight and nine this evening. The next Bill is House Bill 1657. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur with Senate Amendments
Speaker Lechowicz
1, 2, 3 and 4. / 1657. Do you want to correct the board, please? And the Lady moves that we concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4. And...is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask the Sponsor of this Bill to either nonconcur in all or I'm going to move to divide. And I say that for this reason. On the other side of the aisle you have a Minority Spokesman of Appropriations I Committee, Jacob Wolf. He and I have worked effectively together and we feel very strongly about five hundred thousand dollars that was restored in a Senate Amendment in operations. And we think that this Bill should go to a Conference Committee. And we think that the Appropriations I Committee did an outstanding job in ferreting out some very questionable contracts in the Young Adult Conservation Corps. And the Gentleman that heads that Young Adult Conservation Corps is just trying to use his muscle on the other side of the rotunda and force this Appropriations Committee to negate all of the



hard work that we did. I think that would be highly irresponsible in the work that we did. And I think that the Sponsor of this Bill is aware, is vividly aware of our work on that Committee. She's a Member of it and she knows of the meeting that we held that day. It was almost embarrassing. In fact, at the end of that Committee, I said I felt sorry for Director Kenny. It was a Committee meeting where he didn't know, nor did anybody know...there wasn't a soul that knew who the Legislative Liason...was contracted to be a Legislative Liason, can you imagine that, for the young...Youth...Youth Adult Conservation Corp. Nobody knew who he was, not even the Director. And for us to concur now with all of these Amendments and restore those funds, I think, would be the height of irresponsibility. So I would ask that the Sponsor respond to my question...not my question, but my plea, that she nonconcur or I'm going to divide and ask all of this side of the aisle to join me in...in working against her motion to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The..."

Matijeovich: "And I think I'll be joined by Jacob J. Wolf, whom I believe is asking recognition."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would join with Chairman Matijeovich is asking that we nonconcur, at least in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4. Senate Amendment #1 has reduced a considerable amount of money here that is needed for the Game and Fish Fund. Without this, there's fifty thousand dollars, I know, for Frank Holten Park. There's the lake...Clinton Lake which is scheduled to open up in a month or two out here in DeWitt County, I believe. That's going to be hampered by this. There is one hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the Rock Island Trail. There's all kinds of



money. What Mr. Matijevich said was absolutely true, with respect to Amendment #2. The Conservation Youth Corps was sold to us some years ago...about two or three years ago and said it won't cost the state anything. It's all Federal money. There won't be a dime in state funds involved. And now because there is an anticipation, and I repeat, an anticipation that some of the Federal funds may be reduced, they're asking for five hundred thousand dollars in General Revenue Funds to perpetuate this. This is a precedent, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, never have we ever undertaken a hundred percent fully Federally funded program and tried to pick up the tab with state funds before General Revenue Funds. This is a foot in the door. As far as Amendment #4 goes, I know it failed in...in Senate Committee and I know that it was scheduled and posted twice in the House and the Sponsor never even bothered to show up. And so I would join the Majority...the Chairman of Appropriations I Committee in asking for a nonconcurrency."

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

Friedland: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The...there is a motion to divide and that means we will be acting upon each of the Senate Amendments individually. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, to close."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

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

Hoxsey: "May I have a Roll Call on the motion to divide the question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You don't need a Roll Call. This is just a request and if one person requests it, then it's automatic."

Hoxsey: "All right. That's his privilege then."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me."



Hoxsey: "That's his privilege to divide the question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Ma'am."

Hoxsey: "I would move to concur in Senate Amendment 1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is...the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1657? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 52 'ayes' and 92 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does not concur with Senate Amendment #1. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "All right. I would make a motion to concur with Senate Amendment 2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1657. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. On that question, the Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to explain his vote."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of concurrence of Amendment #2. This does appropriate five hundred thousand dollars from the General Revenue Fund for a very, very worthwhile program throughout the State of Illinois. The Illinois Young Adult Conservation Corp is known nationally. It has received many, many certifications and appraisal from people on the federal level towards the program, the training and the education of young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-three years of age. It will be a shame, a shame if we don't get this five hundred thousand dollars out of General Revenue Fund because, because the Democrat President of the United States has cut this program, after one year, saying then that he was for young people in the United States, young people in Illinois and now he's come back and cut the program after we've got it started, after we got a good



program started and that side of the aisle now is still determined to continue cutting that program. A lot of young people..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 55 'ayes', 102 'nays' and the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2. Do you want to continue, Ma'am, or do you want to put the rest of them in a Conference Committee? The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey. Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, just a minute."

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

Winchester: "Well, I was...I was in debate. I did not get recorded as voting. I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye' on that Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can be ^{so} recorded. Your time was up, Sir. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments 3 and 4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed... The Lady moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments #3 and 4. Motion prevails... and requests a Conference Committee be formed. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "I want to make sure I heard correctly. Did she nonconcur on everything?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She nonconcurred on 3 and 4 and the House nonconcurred on 1 and 2."

Matijeovich: "Well, how about...I didn't hear her nonconcur on 1 and 2?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I made the announcement that the House nonconcurred on Amendments 1 and 2."

Matijeovich: "Oh, all right, okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "1 and 2 lost. Wait a minute. The



substitute motion is that the House nonconcur on Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed... The House nonconcur on Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 1657, a Conference Committee will be formed. House Bill 1679, Mr. John Dunn. John Dunn. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, trying to get your attention. What happened with Amendment 5 on that Bill? I didn't hear it be included."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's not on the Calendar, Mr. Leverenz. There's only 1, 2, 3 and 4 on the Calendar."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to arise for the third time today on the same point. But now my friends in the House tell me the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, himself, has been visiting in Jerry Bradley's office, my downstate leader, trying to peel off downstate Democrats for a phony road program. And I think it's about time Jerry Bradley understands I mean it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right on the floor, Sir. You can talk to him, he's right in the back."

Matijevich: "Well, then he ought to lock the door to his office."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Just an inquiry, Mr..."

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

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry on some of these Bills that we are either concurring and non-concurring with. Especially when you have multiple Amendments, it is...is it not the procedure that if one Amendment is not concurred with that the Bill simply goes back into Conference and the Bill is open



totally whether we concur with any of the others or not?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Not necessarily because they can recede from the Amendment in the Senate as well and pass the Bill."

Barnes: "I see. Thank you very much."

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

Bowman: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the Order of Nonconcurrency, are we going to go to that Order before eight o'clock so we can move those Bills into Conference?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "To do what?"

Bowman: "Are we going to go to the Order of Nonconcurrency so that we can act on the Bills on the Supplemental Calendar before eight o'clock this evening and so we can move those Bills into Conference this evening?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. I'll try to get to that Order before that time."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now before us is the Order of Concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1679. Mr. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This...I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7...1679. All Senate Amendment #1 says is that this Bill shall apply only to school districts having less than five hundred thousand inhabitants. It excludes the City of Chicago. And all of the aspects of this Bill are in the same form as it was when it left the House."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise, again, to oppose this Bill and submit to you



that residency should be...or should be determined by the Board of Education at the time an employee starts. And if it is made a condition then, then it is...the employee has an opportunity to determine whether or not he or she wants to work for the school district. If he or she does not, they may not. But I submit to you...and that Mr. Speaker, is the present state of the law, both in Chicago and downstate, the law is uniform. Now, what Mr. Dunn, with his Bill, proposes to do is to take out that ^{beginning} condition of /employment so that that cannot be considered either, residency cannot be considered as a condition of beginning employment. And what Mr. Dunn, I think probably wisely, in an effort to get the Bill passed and in opposition to what that friend of the Chicago teachers did last year, Representative Pierce, he excluded Chicago. He did that not in so many words, but in the Act that he amended, he excluded Chicago. Now what the Senate did when the Bill got over there was to specifically state that the Bill excludes Chicago. Now I submit to you what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that residency in the City of Chicago has been changed all together and that Chicago teachers now, by Mr. Dunn's action, will have to be residents of the Chicago Board of Education area. I think those devious Senators have put one over on us. They have given us an Amendment that has required that the people living in the outlying areas, many of whom live in the Sixth District and are great supporters of me because they know that I am a great friend of the Chicago teachers, they're all going to be called back to the city, Mr. Speaker, and they're going to have to live in Chicago to work for the Board of Education. If that is not true, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Dunn argues with my analysis of the...of Senate Amendment #1, then what is the point in Senate Amendment #1?



There is absolutely no point to it at all, except to undo what Representative Pierce did two years ago with my help. And I submit to you that Representative Pierce is going to have that plaque, given to him by the Chicago teachers, taken away from him. It's got a string on it, Mr. Speaker, and it comes back. And next October, Representative Pierce, you can go to the Turner's Hall and you can find me up at the table being presented with your plaque and you can sit in the rear of the Turner's Hall where I sat eating stringy corn beef. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to vote 'no' on this concurrence because the effect of it is to require all Chicago teachers to live in Chicago or could be if the Chicago Board of Education so selects."

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

Stanley: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of concurrence to Amendment #1. And I do so in sense that if you're from a suburban district or a downstate district, all of you know teachers that are married couples, I'm sure, who one teaches in one district and one teaches in another. And a residency requirement, I think, is unfair and I think is unconstitutional in that sense. So I would encourage a concurrence... a positive vote on this...this concurrence motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to close. Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am a little distressed and a little surprised that my district mate would say that we don't care what happens to the teachers in Chicago, so long as the teachers in the suburbs are taken care of. I don't think that's the proper way to look at legislation. All...this legislation should be concerned with the rights of all citizens of this state. And I'm not going to abandon the teachers in Chicago,



just as I hope we're not abandoned on a RTA rip-off deal."

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

Willer: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question. I'm confused."

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

Willer: "Is the Gentleman from Cook, specifically the Sixth District, correct in his analysis of the Bill as amended?"

Dunn: "No, he's not. Chicago is not in this legislation. This legislation addresses a different section of the School Code and the section which applies to Chicago. And because there was some similar confusion in the Senate, an Amendment was added in the Senate which says that the...that the Bill specifically shall not ...shall only apply in school districts where there are less than five hundred thousand inhabitants. I don't know how much clearer you can make it, Chicago is out."

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I won't take a lot of time. This is a good Bill. This is a Bill which was proposed on behalf of those who live downstate, principally in rural areas where the school districts are small, where the village or community in which the schools are located are small and where teachers may or may not have to live elsewhere. This will enable those who must live outside of the district to find living there and to still come into the district to work. It's a good Bill. It's supported by the Illinois Education Association and I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1679? All in favor



vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, to explain his vote.

Timer's on."

Polk: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll pass."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Polk. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. My name happened to be mentioned in debate. I'm sorry, that was the Plumber's Hall, Sir. I'm sorry you had the bad spaghetti there. But this Bill doesn't do what, I think, you think it does. What this Bill does is...for downstate school districts, it says that a residency shall not be a condition of employment. It doesn't, in any way, affect the Bill we passed for junior colleges and elementary and secondary, seeing those are already working for the district can't be forced to move into the district. It doesn't change that provision at all. In fact, I think I should get a...a second award and therefore I would own the placque and you couldn't take it away from me anymore. I don't think he's listening, but anyway, I think I'll get a second award for this and I'll own the placque and you can take it away. I'll retire the placque based on this speech. I think what the Gentleman's Bill does is...says that outside of Chicago..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, go on, continue."

Pierce: "I'm on a point of personal privilege, I was named viciously in debate. I think what the Bill says is that outside of Chicago, residency can't be made a condition of employment for teachers. It doesn't affect administrators. But in Chicago it doesn't change the law which at presently is, it can be a condition of employment, but once you're employed, it can't be used to...to force you to move if it wasn't a condition of employment when you were first employed."



So I don't think it changes that grandfather provision and therefore, I will vote for the concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think the last Gentleman was listening to me and I...I shall not...this is a point of personal privilege. He mentioned my name."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, he did not."

Walsh: "He did."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He did not."

Walsh: "He said a Gentleman. I'm the only Gentleman around here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I can...I distinctly heard Mr. Walsh's name being mentioned. Now get up there and get your point of personal privilege."

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

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question more than explain my vote. I've heard two Gentlemen tell two conflicting stories. I'd like to know which one is true. I have a number of teachers in my district, a lot of them live in the suburbs, and I don't want to get those teachers mad at me by voting against their best interests. I want to know..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stick with the award winner."

McAuliffe: "I want to know which one is telling the exact truth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stick with the award winner. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'ayes', 23 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill



1679. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mugalian: "Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point, Sir?"

Mugalian: "My point is that I'm certain that I misunderstood the Bill and I...made some remarks that may have reflected upon the distinguished Representative from Streamwood and I'd like to withdraw those remarks."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. House Bill 570. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain. We're getting there. Mr. McClain. Oh, did we do 570? Oh, I'm sorry, that's McAuliffe's. All right. House Bill 1226, Mr. Taylor. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #1...Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1226 ...it gives a salary increase for the secretary of the Circuit Court Judges. That's all it does. It's fifteen thousand a year...of 1980, seventeen thousand ...in 19...seventeen thousand, 1980, fifteen thousand at present, seventeen thousand in 1980 and eighteen thousand in 1981. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1226."

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

Boucek: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Boucek: "How many secretaries does that Chief Judge have now?"

Taylor: "I don't know how many secretaries he has now, but this is in every circuit throughout the State of Illinois."

Boucek: "Well, speaking about Cook County and the suburban area and all the municipal districts, the presiding judges now have at least two secretaries. You mean they



need one more?"

Taylor: "No, no. This doesn't increase it, it just increases their salaries."

Boucek: "That isn't what the Amendment says. It says...a secretary supervisor, doesn't it?"

Taylor: "No, no. The Amendment dispenses the salaries out over a three year period, 1979, fifteen thousand dollars, 1980, seventeen thousand dollars, 1981, eighteen thousand dollars. That's all it does."

Boucek: "I think this is a waste of the taxpayer's money and I urge the defeat of this Amendment to nonconcur to...the fact that after working fourteen years in the Circuit Court of Cook County, in the Fifth Municipal District, for a presiding judge who had two secretaries. And I urge its defeat."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know anything about the circuit that he was in, but I'm certainly going to move for the adoption of this proposal because I know that the secretaries, just as well as the judges and ourselves need the pay increase. Many of the secretaries right here in the state capital need a pay...salary increase. So I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1226."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1226? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'ayes', 26 'noes', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1226. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1535. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."



1535, as it went out of the House, 150 to about 0, I believe, just simply required reports from the Department of Public Health on atomic energy plants. That's not much of a variation of their responsibilities now, reporting process is the only addition in that language. However, when the Bill went to the Senate, the equivalent of House Bill 262 was entered on to my Bill. The House Sponsor was Representative Mautino and I think he may want to address that issue. However, I would also like to add a few points. One is, I, do wish to concur. To begin with, I accept the feel...the notion that the state has the right to regulate for health and safety. In this case, that is the question of nuclear spent waste. We regulated areas like the railroads, hospitals and other provisions, and I find no conflict or problem with the essential and important ingredient of regulating nuclear waste. There is presently in Illinois the Morris operation, which is owned and operated by General Electric, Morris has two water basins for holding radioactive waste. They were originally licensed, I think, to accept spent fuel for reprocessing. However, they had some problems and they do not deal with reprocessing but rather just with storage. That was the licensing that took place in 1971. We currently store about three hundred and nine metric tons with a potential capacity, as of 1975..."

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

Meyer: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I question the germaneness of Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Parliamentarian kindly come up to the Speaker's Podium? Would the Parliamentarian come to the Speaker's Podium, please? There is a question of germaneness of Amendment #1 to House Bill



1535."

Meyer: "May I...may I address the question of germaneness?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Meyer: "It would appear that Senate Amendment...which was adopted to House Bill 1535 is not germane do paragraph 197 of the Radiation Installation Act, Chapter 111½, paragraph 194 through 200. Paragraph 197 of that Act deals with an investigation radiation installations. The Amendment prohibits the disposal or storage of spent nuclear fuel which was generated outside the State of Illinois. It would appear that closing the ^{state} borders does not fit into the Radiation Installation Act."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Meyer, do you want to repeat what... the Parliamentarian was busy talking with someone else when you read your point?"

Meyer: "Okay. It would appear that Senate Amendment...the Senate Amendment which was adopted to this Bill is not germane to paragraph 197 of the Radiation Installation Act. I might underline that, the Radiation Installation Act, Chapter 111½, paragraphs 194 through 200. Paragraph 197 of the Act deals with investigation of radiation installations. The Amendment prohibits the disposal or storage of spent nuclear fuel which was generated outside the State of Illinois. It would appear that closing of the state's borders does not, I might underline 'not', fit into the Radiation Installation Act."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. He has requested a decision by the Parliamentarian, but I would like to point out that included in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1535...is included the reciprocity agreement with other states within the union. Therefore, I do believe it falls in the purview of this area of the



statute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Amendment is germane. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and Members, as I was saying, that the capacity for the Morris operation is that about seven hundred and fifty, if I'm correct. Presently, they store a little bit over three hundred. We hold... the point of the legislation, however, is directed at the question of whether or not Illinois ought to be a receiver for the spent fuel from states like California, Wisconsin and Connecticut. Those states, themselves, have their own facilities. They do indeed have nuclear power plants. And we have become their...at least part of, the holding state for their spent fuel. Other operations, for example in Illinois, the Commonwealth Edison Dresden Plant, which is in Illinois, would not be affected by this because they would, of course, be able to store their waste in Illinois. Other power plants basically throughout the country have their own storage facilities. So what we're saying in the legislation, if I read Representative Mautino and Christensen and Senator Joyce and Demazio properly, what I'm saying is that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me again, Mr. Schneider..."

Schneider: "...we would like to..."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is he on his closing remarks?"

Speaker / Lechowicz: "No, Sir, he's..."

Piel: "He's answering a question, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue..."

Schneider: "I have an opening...opening statement, Representative Piel, that's the Sponsor is entitled to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Schneider: "So we are arguing then that the State of Illinois



would be willing, with agreement by reciprocity, approved of course by the Governor and the General Assembly, for purposes of receiving nuclear waste. I don't see any problem with that. It seems that we have the responsibility of our constituents to deal with this kind of issue because it is, of course, sensitive in the light of Three Mile Island. Three Mile Island, of course, is a plant. But what we're talking about here is the allusions to safety or the lack of it. There have been reiterated in many cases, even on the question of spent fuel, the potential for hazards. Presumably transportation accidents could involve spent fuel assemblies going to...to and from the Morris facility. The potential for natural disasters such as earthquakes, Morris, as we know, is near a fault or tornados where Morris itself is located in a high tornado risk area. That could damage a facility like Morr...the G.E. operation...accidents during routine handling of fuel assemblies. There has been an accident in Morris...operating mistakes, such as those that are caused by human error. So we are trying in our best interest in this Amendment from the Senate to regulate for the health and safety of the people of our district. I think it's an important piece of legislation. I would hope that the House would concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 5...1535."

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

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to point out to the Body that the United States Supreme Court in Case #77404, City of Philadelphia versus the State of New Jersey, spoke on the issue where they said no state could bar the transport of interstate waste which was declared a hazard by the State of New Jersey. In a subsequent case involving the Circuit Court of



Appeals, the State of Oklahoma attempted to bar the importation of hazardous waste where they said that if the...if the sending state had a reciprocal agreement that the State of Oklahoma would accept it. If the sending state did not have a reciprocal agreement, the State of Oklahoma would not accept it. This legislation is patently unconstitutional on its face. It will just cost the State of Illinois and the Attorney General money to litigate it. And for those reasons, I believe, it should be defeated. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in favor of the Amendment. The information that G.E. sent out in opposition to this Bill said that if out-of-state plants could not send nuclear/^{waste} to the Morris plant they would be forced to close when their on site storage filled. Well I would just like to say that this does just exactly what they want. This would keep Morris open so that we could store our own waste and not be filled up with out-of-state waste. Another thing, if...if we do not put a stop to this as Representative Schneider said, they're approximately half ^{fifty-} full now, in July there's going to be/six truck loads of nuclear waste shipped to the Morris plant. Twenty-one metric tons will be coming over the highway in July to fill up this plant. Now we do not intend to be a no nuke or to stop the plants. All we say is we'll take your waste if you'll take ours. And we've got to remember, as representatives of the people, we have to protect the people when these roads are on... when trucks are on the roads with hazardous waste. And I think we should adopt this Amendment."

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



Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it just seems that some Bills just never die. This is about the third time this has come up and some Amendment...Senate Amendment #1 is actually Senate Bill 262, which was unable to receive the necessary votes to report...to be reported out of Committee. Now we find it on this Bill and House Bill 1535. We've got a brand new industry. This weekend we will witness it more, just as much as everybody else, when we're going to try to go home because of the energy shortage. Instead of encouraging this new source of energy, we are stipulating fines up to ten thousand dollars for each violation. And then it's the last sentence in this Amendment that really scares me. The State's Attorney, in a county where a violation occurs, or Attorney General, may institute a civil action for an immediate injunction to halt any activity which is in violation of this Act. Any little violation that might...they feel is necessary, they can close a nuclear power plant in the State of Illinois. I think that we ought to give this a chance. Let this Bill go to Interim Study. Give it a little more time. Let's not hinder a brand new industry that might save this country."

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If it hadn't been for visiting Morris about four months ago, I would definitely be in favor of the Senate Amendment. I went through the facility, the General Electric facility in Morris. I spent a considerable amount of time there. I think probably the most beneficial thing, and it deals directly with this Amendment, is the four minute movie that they showed us before we went into the plant. This four minute movie shows them putting the rods into the



canister to transport across the United States. This canister has thirty-two bolts on the top of it. To give you an idea, a water tower that is bolted down has approximately eight. This canister has thirty-two bolts on the...on each end of it to hold it in place. They take a truck, with this canister on, drive it into a cement wall going sixty-five miles an hour. They take that same canister, put it on another truck, put the truck across a railroad crossing. They have a train drive into the side of this canister going eighty miles an hour. They take the same canister, put it on another train, have that train drive into a cement wall going eighty miles an hour. And then they take that same canister, put it in aviation fuel, light the aviation fuel and leave that canister in that aviation fuel for an hour and a half. At which time, they open up the canister and the rods are still intact. I wish that all of the chemicals that we transported across county on our train system were this safe. I will repeat that there was no spent fuel that leaked out after these series of tests. They also state...the problem a lot of people think is...with a spent fuel situation, is that this will go into the air. If it's spilled onto the ground it does not go into the air. The ground where it is spilled would be contaminated, but it would not go into the air. Once this container gets to the plant in Morris, Illinois, it is flipped up on end, lifted into a forty foot tank of water, at which time the top is taken off. They only need..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Piel: "I've got ten minutes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're coming close."

Piel: "You've only got...you only need sixteen feet for all



safe...disposition of this spent fuel out of the canister. At which time they store it. They have approximately only one-third of the area used...at the Morris facility. So when they say that over half of the area is used, they're very wrong. So, when they're talking about transporting, they are very wrong on this Amendment and I would ask you for its defeat. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen.

I'd like to pursue my original line of questioning in the response to the germaneness of the Amendment. And for the...information of the Members I would like to point out, the existing statutes..if there is any questions concerning the original propos...question raised by Representative...from the other side of the aisle. The radiation installation question is addressed in Chapter 111½, 185-11. It says, 'It's an Act to require the registration of radiation installations as herein defined.' On page 501 it defines radiation installation as, 'Any location or facility where radiation machines are used or where radioactive material is produced, transported, stored, disposed or used in any purpose.' I think that immediately solves the germaneness question. To address the concurrence in which I totally concur, this is Senate Bill 262 and it is an Illinois Bill. What we are talking about in this instance..and I wish that Rep...General Griesheimer was here since the same proposal has been presented at the Zion Plant because their facility is now being put to its most full extent. What we have here is, if in fact, you want the State of Illinois to be the nuclear rod storage center for the United States, I would recommend you vote 'no' on this Bill. And what you're telling



the people of the State of Illinois, yes, we will accept all of the nation's nuclear waste and rods for storage in Morris, Illinois. If, in fact, you want to vote for the people of the State of Illinois with a reciprocity agreement with other states under existing contracts, you will vote for this concurrence and send this Bill down to the Governor's desk. It's most important that you address this question. As a Member of President Carter's Task Force on Nuclear Waste Management, it is incumbent upon the states in this union to embark upon a program which we can't enact in the statute because the Federal Government does not have a waste management plan. I would then ...I would then present to you this argument, a vote 'yes' on this concurrence is a vote for the citizens of the State of Illinois. A vote 'no' is a vote for those citizens in the State of Washington, California, New York, South Carolina and the rest of the Nation. So I ask for your favorable support in this concurrence."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to address another issue, if I may, and not specifically the merits of the motion to concur with the Senate Amendment. I'm Chairman of the Environment Committee, and Mr. Meyers, the Minority Spokesman, as we discussed many Bills on nuclear energy and nuclear safety, no matter how many Bills we heard in our Committee, we found generally... after Bill after Bill in our Committee...it was such a complex thing that our Committee ended up knowing less and less about the program. So what we did is, we set up a Subcommittee on Nuclear Safety, chaired in the House by Dan Pierce. Senator Knuppel I called, and Senator Knuppel set up a similar Subcommittee in the Senate sponsored by Senator Joyce, who is the



sponsor really of House Bill 262 which is the Amendment on this piece of legislation. Now the point that I'm trying to get at is the issues are so complex, that our Committee, that heard hours of testimony, could not make up their decision. On House Bill...Senate Bill 262, we did ^{not}/give it the votes. We asked Senator Joyce if he would give us the right to place that Bill on that working Subcommittee so that they could go around the State of Illinois, have public hearings, visit plants and try to learn the issues so that they could give us, the full Assembly, a recommendation on nuclear safety and what we ought to do. Senator Joyce said no. Now, Mr. Mautino is sort of an expert, Mr. Christensen, sort of an expert. The same Bill that we're now considering that's attached to Mr. Schneider's Bill is House Bill 2584 which is George Ryan's Bill. We held that Bill in Committee...and you know the clout of George Ryan. We held that Bill in Committee because we determined that the Committee was not adequately educated to make a decision of this nature. Likewise, Mr. Christensen had a Bill, 2520. We held that in Committee. The issue is not whether or not it's a simple reciprocity action. What you're talking about is a very complicated field. It is not simple. I thought the Committee, from Mr. Meyer's perspective and the majority's perspective, that the Committee was going to study it under the Leadership of Mr. Pierce and Mr. Joyce. And because of that we had their promises to have public hearings and testimony and going around the state. I think that's a reasonable, responsible action to a very complicated issue. And I ask you, in this case, not to give the required 89 votes for concurrence."

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



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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to close."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think the Members who were originally involved in this proposition, and I'm now the carrier of the question, have exhibited not only some personal experience in it in their own areas but, have indeed, been dealing with the issue for a number of years. It's been public in the newspapers and other controversies. I think it's time the State of Illinois acts, as I said, consistent with the responsibilities and authority to deal with the safety of our citizens. I would very simply that we do concur, again, to Amendment #1 to House Bill 1535."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1535? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill, in my opinion, was a good Bill when it passed out of the House. Senate Amendment #1 is obviously in violation of the Commerce Clause of the U.S. Constitution by prohibiting imports. But not only that, it's unwise legislation. Morris is only temporary, above ground storage. Someday we'll have permanent underground in another state, Illinois is not considered for that. If we ban importation in this state, unless there's a similar site in another state, the same will happen with the permanent underground storage. We won't be able to send it to another state unless we have underground storage. And we're not going to be an underground permanent storage



state. So this Bill is really against our interests if we want to eventually phase-out Morris as it will be phased-out when New Mexico or some other state is the scene of permanent underground storage of spent nuclear rods. This Bill has nothing to do with the China Syndrome, that wasn't spent nuclear rods. It has nothing to do with Three Mile Island, it..."

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

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a Member of that Subcommittee and I feel that Representative McClain was very ably able in describing the fact that we don't... do not know enough about this. I don't know enough about it. I think Representative Pierce would make a very excellent Chairman. I think he's going to see to it that our Committee looks into these things. I think we should vote 'no' so this will fail. If we can...only get it into the Interim Study Committee or back into our Committee some way, which I don't know whether we can do this or not, I think it would be to the best interests of the people of the State of Illinois. Because we're acting too hastily and without enough knowledge and I'm sure as Member of that Committee ...of Representative Pierce, that he will see to it that we begin to know something about it. So I think we should vote 'no' for the time being anyway."

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

O'Brien: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members. I had my light on and wanted to talk before the vote was taken. But I'd like to rise in support of this Amendment and indicate that I think that this goes a little bit further. If the Federal Government is going to set up a policy of providing us with all the spent nuclear fuel rods in the State of Illinois, I think



they're making a mistake. I think we ought to stand up and vote right now against it. Ninety-one percent of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government, why not put it there? Eighty-eight percent of the land in Nevada is owned by the Federal Government, why not put it there? Sixty-five percent of Utah and fifty-three percent of Oregon, why should we put the spent nuclear waste in the State of Illinois, one of the most populated states in the...in the country? I urge everybody to send the Federal Government a message and vote 'aye' on this."

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

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this concurrence. We have been thrown in this country into an absolute panic about what happened at Three Mile Island. This question has nothing whatsoever to do with Three Mile Island. We are talking about material here that is not, and I repeat, not nuclear waste. It is valuable spent fuel and can be reprocessed elsewhere. Morris is simply an interim facility as been mentioned before. It can be reprocessed later or it can be disposed of in a federal facility. It does not come from all over the country. It comes from limited states, California, Wisconsin, Connecticut. The facility is well managed. It is safe. And I see no reason to move precipitously now at this point to further hamper an industry that can help give us energy independence."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's kind of interesting that I should follow the Gentleman from DuPage in speaking. He's the Chairman of the Illinois Atomic Energy Commission which issued its report...biannual report in January of



this year. And had in that book...in that report, an incredible observation. An observation that Illinois should expand its waste facilities, that Illinois was under facility in waste...that we should have more facilities. Now if ever there was...now that came out in January. I have a sense that they might have changed that if it had come out in May. But in January, the Atomic Energy Commission of Illinois as saying, 'We should expand our waste facilities.' Now Representative Pierce suggested it was just a temporary thing but the Atomic Energy Commission of Illinois says that we should expand our facilities. An incredible, incredible judgment. I think we, therefore, have to vote 'aye' on this."

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

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this concurrence. You know what we're...what we're really doing is taking something that's real simple and trying to make something complicated out of it. All that we're saying is that other states have to reciprocate. If they want to store their rods in our state, we should have the right to store our rods in their state. And it's just that simple. You know that...in Morris Illinois, we are taking rods from all over the United States now. And I don't think that's right because every nuclear plant has their own pool where they store the rods. But what's happening is that when those pools are filling up, they're sending the rods to us. And we should be able to reciprocate with them since the Federal Government hasn't acted in this area, we must act in this area. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, in explaining my 'no' vote in opposition to this...and what Representative Anderson has just said that, should Illinois take the posture in penalizing one of its leading industries, the General Electric Company, for the failure the Federal Government to act. To me, I think, that Representative McClain and the suggestions that have been made here that we spend the time...what's the hurry? I think if...this was put on to Interim Study and these hearings are held and every Member of this House and the General Assembly ought to go to Morris and visit on site and acquaint themselves to the situation and listen to some Subcommittee reports when they come back...and it's a bad, bad Bill at this particular point in time and everybody should be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'ayes', 69 'nays'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, wants a poll of the absentees. Mr. Flinn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's sort of getting crowded back here. I wonder if everybody is authorized to be on the floor that's on the floor now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor, please? Would the Doorkeepers kindly police the floor...now? All unauthorized personnel...remove themselves from the floor. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster. McAuliffe. Molloy. Patrick. Peters. Pouncey."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pouncey wants to be recorded as 'no'. Patrick as 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schlickman. Telcser. Sam Wolf. Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count? On this question there are 77 'ayes', 71 'noes'. The Gentleman's motion fails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr...the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I would now move that the House nonconcur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1535."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur to Amendment #1 to House Bill 1535. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye. And the House nonconcur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 1535. The motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. We have worked yesterday and today a large number of hours and our Calendar is very well. We've been told there's going to be Conference Committees at eight o'clock. I have been informed that the Senate has now adjourned. I'm sure they're not going to stay around for Conference Committees and they've adjourned for the night. And it seems to me with the shape that our Calendar is in and the number of hours that we work that we ought not to be here any longer tonight. And I would hope that you would concur and would talk to the Speaker so that we could proceed to get some rest before we get it jammed to us tomorrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You look in pretty good shape to me, Don. House Bill 893. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask leave that... of the House that the Elections Committee meet in the Speaker's office immediately."

Speaker Lechowicz: "In a minute."

Laurino: "It's the recessed meeting from yesterday."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to have the Elections Committee meet in the Speaker's office immediately. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. House Bill 893. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 5 to House Bill 893. And this, of course, is final action on the Bill. What the Bill does is to conform the Illinois Certificate of Need Law to the Health Planning...the National Health Planning Act. And what the Amendments do, briefly, is this, Amendment #2 deletes the provision making the Act applicable to home health agencies under the Home Health Agency Licensing Act. Senate Amendment #3 makes a number of minor changes requiring the State Health Plan...Facilities Planning Board to provide that recognized area-wide health planning organizations...to provide a recognized area-wide national ...area-wide health planning organization. Senate Amendment #5 extends the period for^{the} review of non-substantive projects from forty-five to sixty days. This was requested by the DHSA. I move that we concur with these three Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, apparently from the Sponsor's explanation of the Amendments, there was one thing the Senate unfortunately did not do with this Bill. Apparently, the Senate has failed to remove kidney disease treatment centers from Certificate of Need. Now I ask you to consider carefully whether you really want state and local bureaucrats who are inspired by federal regulations to decide whether or not someone is going to live or



die by being able to get kidney dialysis. There is already, in my opinion, a shortage of kidney dialysis, kidney disease treatment centers in the State of Illinois. And I don't think this is the time when we want to subject those centers to concerns of bureaucrats. I don't know what your philosophy is on Certificate of Need in general, I certainly think this House should reexamine the entire Certificate of Need law. But as to this Bill, it would under Certificate of Need, under bureaucratic control, under costly delays, decisions on whether kidney patients would be able to be treated or not. Now I don't think that any of the Members of this House currently are in the position of being kidney patients but I think you might remember a Member of this House who passed away shortly after he left office because he could not get a replacement kidney. And I think you will remember that very fine Gentleman who could not spend a great of time with us because of his disease but he did come down here and check in to, I believe it was St. John's, a couple of days a week while he was here in order to get kidney treatment. He was able to conduct an almost normal life until it just got to be too much, you know you can't live on forever with kidney disease. And if you don't want to do it for the people who are suffering with kidney disease now, defeat this concurrence for our late colleague, for his sake. I wish he could be here now because we would all want him to still be here with us. And I also wish he could be here now to help me defeat this very bad Bill. Please vote 'no' on concurrence for the sake of those who are yet living but are suffering from kidney disease. It could be you tomorrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to close."



Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that the other Chief Sponsor of this Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. There was a...I had my Calendar over there. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we all know that the posture of this Bill when it left the House, it was bad. It's been made infinitely worse in the Senate. Initially what the Bill would have done, would have extended the Certificate of Need process to kidney dialysis and certain other things. What the Senate did to make the Bill worse was everything that opponents of this kind of control have cautioned against for years. Number one, we extend the time period that these agencies have for review. That means you can't add a new facility without a more extended time period, more delay, more bureaucratic delay in the process of approving new health care facilities. Then number two, we do the next worse thing possible, we include two or three more agencies that have to sign off before it's going to be approved. We're creating a process that is so clumsy, so awkward, so slow, so unworkable that we're just eliminating new health care resources. And what this Bill really ought to be a referendum on is that ...is that a proper way to provide health care treatment or should we try to get more resources into the process and let a market mechanism work? I urge a 'no' vote as strongly on this as I can on any Bill that we consider."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, may Representative Kempiners, who is the Chief Sponsor of the Bill with me, offer the



closing?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that, Ma'am?"

Chapman: "Mr. Kempiners."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a Joint Chief Sponsor on this Bill and there are some things that it does add. And, as the Lady indicated, it does add kidney disease treatment centers to the Certificate of Need Board Certification or at least review. And the whole purpose of this whole review is to determine medical need, which means if there is a need for one of these facilities, that will be a priority in that area. And there will be every emphasis made to obtain one of those machines. That's the whole purpose of Certificate of Need, to determine what the need...the medical need of an area is. I think that these Amendments in the Senate enhance this Bill. Quite frankly, it took home health care agencies out of those facilities that have to be reviewed. Certificate of Need is for facilities, not for services. And I would urge your support of the Senate Amendments to House Bill 893."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 5 to House Bill 893? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'ayes', 39 'noes'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 5 to House Bill 893. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 336. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."



Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 336, as it passed the House, further clarified existing authority which permits investment of public funds in insured savings and loans associations. These...I would ask for concurrence in the Senate Amendment which was put on by the Senate Finance Committee which increased the rate of interest on tax anticipation warrants from six to eight percent. This legislation is supported by the Illinois Association of Park Districts, Savings and Loans Stock Council, Illinois Municipal League, Savings and Loan League and the Home Builders Association. I...adhere...to your concurrence in this Amendment."

Continued on Page 235



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 229...336?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 336. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1596. Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this...House Bill 1596 is a product of the Administrative Rules...Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. It came about in order to clarify some of the ambiguities and some of the rules and regs that the Revenue Department put on the tax relief program for machinery and equipment. That's basically what the Bill does. We've already passed it by a substantial majority, but I would like to go through the Amendments briefly one by one, and I'll answer any questions. Senate Amendment...Senate Amendment #1 covers a situation where, for example, Ford Motor Company, who produces many, many Fords for sale, and if they had new machinery they could claim it except that they lease some of them, and they wouldn't be able to claim any of the... of the tax exemption in case of leasing...not just for anybody that does it. The Senate Amendment #2 provides that you can file a separate certificate of exemption, and the Bill provides that, but the Senate Amendment #2 provides it could all be done on one piece of paper rather than literally thousands of pieces of paper, and Senate Amendment #3 was withdrawn in the Senate, and we're not considering it here. Senate Amendment #4, in my opinion, is really a useless one, but it was one put on at the insistence of the AFL-CIO, which asked that this...those people claiming exemptions on machinery would name the number of people they've laid off or terminated...name the



number of workers retained as employees or name the number of new jobs created. There is no enforcement provision for that, and so I think it's, therefore, useless, but I will not object to it or take the time of this House any longer. Amendment #5 exempts the sale of materials to a purchaser who produces and then rent or lease the exempted certain type or for the...or the same thing. If he produces the machine himself, he gets at least exemption from the cost of the materials it takes to build a machine insofar as the sales tax is concerned. Amendment #6 adds the exemption of tool, dies, jigs, fixtures, and patterns, but exempts...but does not exempt hand tools or that sort of thing, and the last Amendment, Amendment #7, requires the user to furnish the certificate of order...merely is a support of the exemption, and...and that's something that ...it's a paper...saves a lot of paperwork for those people applying for the expense...the...for the exemption of the tax . I would ask the House to concur in Amendments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Schuneman: "Representative Flinn, one of the problems with this Bill and with Bills like it when they came before the Revenue Committee, was the fact that business was coming in and asking that the statutes be clarified, but at the same time, they were asking us to extend the exemption on the sales tax to include replacement and repair parts. And, many of us who voted for that Bill last Session were unwilling to give industry a sales tax exemption for repair and replacement parts. Our logic being that we supported the Bill originally with the idea that there should be a tax exemption for capital improvements which would create jobs, but that we should not



allow an exemption for re...simple ordinary repair and replacement parts. My question to you is, first of all, does...does your Bill now permit a tax exemption on repair and replacement parts?"

Flinn: "It...it would on replacement but not necessarily repair. For example, if it's ordinary wear and tear of something that requires say a brick lining or that sort of thing that wears out on a...on a repetitive basis it would not be exempt, but if it was a new installation or building a new type of oven or whatever it be, then it would be new in that case, so it's sort of ...that's a gray line area you're talking about."

Schuneman: "Okay, and the other...the other problem I had with one of these Bills is that one of them would've provided an exemption for the purchase of hand tools and dies..."

Flinn: "No...no, it doesn't..."

Schuneman: "...and that sort of thing. Has that been taken out of the Bill?"

Flinn: "No, it has the dies, but hand tools are exempted. We went into the dies, because..."

Schuneman: "Well, you don't mean they're exempted from the..."

Flinn: "...but we went halfway on that, Cal. We left hammers, wrenches, that sort of thing out. All hand tools are not exempt."

Schuneman: "So, alright."

Flinn: "Well..."

Schuneman: "Alright. Well, thank you, and Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the Bill. I think that this Bill now has...is in the shape where I can support it, whereas before I did not, and I would urge a concurrence."

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

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Monroe, this...if you didn't touch on it before, does



this provide where parts can be purchased and actually built into a machine and then would be exempt?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Okay. Yes, but the only claim for exemption in that case, Tom, would be for the cost of the material. They could not claim the cost of their labor...their in-house labor. It would only be for the parts of the material they spent in building their own machine."

Ewing: "I...I think this is...had this not been a complaint with the old law that we eliminated people. They had to go out and buy a machine already rebuilt..."

Flinn: "Yes...yes."

Ewing: "...and they couldn't get that benefit themselves?"

Flinn: "Just...the Amend...the Senate Amendments correct that... not the Bill, but the Senate Amendments do correct that problem."

Ewing: "And...in almost all cases then this is clarification plus it does...does not include what we would call ordinary expenses...things that would be written off in one year?"

Flinn: "Right. Absolutely."

Ewing: "The printers are not included in this. Is that correct?"

Flinn: "No, I refused to permit the Senate to put on the printers' Amendment. I think that was Amendment #3 that was withdrawn. That would've killed the Bill, and I absolutely forbade them to put it on there, lest I kill the Bill myself."

Ewing: "And are they able to file now on a quarterly basis instead of with every purchase?"

Flinn: "Yes, I...originally in the Bill I had provided for a quarterly basis file, but I failed to recognize that there would be literally thousands of pieces of paper to file, and so the Senate...one of the Senate Amendments provides that all of those exemptions can be filed on one piece of paper or every...how many pieces of paper it takes to file them altogether."



Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to this piece of legislation. I think in a very honest fashion we have to realize that sometimes the bureaucracy, which we have in Springfield, hampers ^{the} administration of certain Bills which we want carried out. On the other hand, I think that we have to realize that sometimes business and, yes, the unions are greedy in what they are trying to get from government. I think that this good Sponsor has done an excellent job in working out some of the bugs that were put in or were inherent in the Bill we passed last year to give business a tax exemption on capital investment. He's done an excellent job. I think it's been considered well in both Houses, and I think we should support his motion to concur in these Amendments."

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

Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Flinn: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Can you give me the fiscal impact of this for the next four years?"

Flinn: "There is no fiscal impact at all. The fiscal impact was in Senate Bill 736. It was passed in the 80th General Assembly, and all this is is clarification language. It ...it points out to the Department of Revenue that they cannot regulate themselves around legislation passed by this General Assembly."

Mugalian: "Well, I'd like to speak briefly to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Mugalian: "Business was not satisfied with the regulations published by the Department of Revenue on the Bill that exempted sales tax from machinery and equipment, and it's clear to me that...that this Bill would do in clarifying that language is substantially increase the exemption and would, therefore, have a substantial impact on state



revenues. I just want to say that last night we talked about sales tax on food and how that should have a priority. Also, the Democratic Party suggested that that was the only kind of tax relief that we could afford this year. I think this Bill is going to sail out of here, but I want to keep my integrity and help the Democratic Party keep its integrity by voting against an additional deduction for business, especially on the sales tax."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed...the previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, to close."

Flinn: "Well, briefly, Mr. Speaker. The...the last speaker was speaking against Senate Bill 736, which was passed in the 80th General Assembly and not this Bill. This Bill is a clarification Bill. I think I've explained it pretty well, and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 to House Bill 1596?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Record me as...as 'aye', please. Zeke, give me as 'aye', please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'ayes', 14 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 to House Bill 1596. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2283. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Continued on Page 241



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 makes two technical changes in the Bill. The word 'station' was added to the beginning paragraph in which the eligibility requirements of the stations are defined. Additionally, the word 'eligible' which was referenced throughout the Bill was deleted. The two technical changes made by the Amendment make the language of the Bill more uniform. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2283."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't really care what is in the Senate Amendment because it couldn't make the Bill any worse than it was when it left the House. Unfortunately, the Bill did get, after a verification, got the usual treatment of the House and went up to about 110. But it was a lot closer than that and it should have been...should have gotten 110 'no' votes. Because this is probably one of the most dangerous Bills that we will consider this Session or any other Session because it calls into play the freedom of public television to operate in the past the way it has operated and the way the other...media, such as radio, television and newspapers operate. What we're seeking to do in House Bill 2283 is put our public TV stations at the public trough. And I suggest to you that this dangerous notion of putting our public TV stations at the public trough will put them under the yoke of governmental controls. Now a lot of you laugh at that. The TV station managers laughed at it in Committee when I suggested it to them. But I can recall seeing a program on public TV telling about how during the Nixon administration efforts were made by the Nixon



administration to control the output of public television on various aspects of the Federal Government. And the dangerous part is, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House, is that the public TV stations admitted and the documents that were brought out under the Freedom of Information Act showed without a doubt that they did knuckle under, they did knuckle under in order to get the Federal money that they say they needed. And I suggest to you, when they line up at the public trough here in Springfield, that they are going to knuckle under also. I suggest to you that when we have a Chairman of Appropriations Committee from the City of Chicago, WTTW in Chicago is going to pull a lot of punches in trying to expose some of the corruption in that city. This is a dangerous precedent to put a media form of information...a media under the control, and that's what you're going to be doing, under the control of the State Government. They're going to knuckle under, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House, in order to get the almighty dollar...and don't let them do it. Let's kill this Bill once and for all and vote not to concur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 2283."

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

Davis: "Well thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to just take a minute or two to reflect on something my running mate just said. I think in many ways he's certainly accurate. Public television certainly does not need to be tied to the strings of the purse of any government agency who can control its editorial comments, its investigative reporting and the things that make public television in the State of Illinois what it is. Although, there is another side of that coin that I think you ought to take a look at and



examine and maybe there's an argument for the other side. And that simply would be this. If public television is innovative and creative and maybe if we did give them that money, we could censor them because public television is so creative that WTTW, Channel 11 in the City of Chicago who normally has some of the finest programming in the world, was the first public television station in the United States to show frontal nudity into your home when they published...or when they produced the play 'Steambath'. Now I particularly enjoyed it in the privacy of my home because Valerie Perrine was the star. And if you've ever seen here up close on the screen or if you've ever seen anyone who looks like her, you know she's not all bad to look at in a frontal nudity position. But they sent that into your homes at an eight to ten o'clock time slot. Now the argument could be made, if we gave them five million, maybe we wouldn't see Valerie Perrine anymore which would upset me and probably upset my four year old son but I'm not sure my daughters want to see Valerie Perrine nude. So I don't know that probably Representative Leinenweber's argument is better than either one that I've given you. And I think at this point we ought to defeat subsidies to public television who seem to do rather well for themselves."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to close. Madigan to close. You'll be able to explain your vote."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the main Bill would provide annual state assistance



grants to all public television stations based in the state. The amount would be based in proportion to each station's comparative annual operating costs in the prior fiscal year. The Bill would assist six public television stations located throughout the state in the following cities: Carbondale, Olney, Chicago, Peoria, Urbana, Champaign. Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2283. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J.J. Wolf, to explain his vote. Timer is on."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, some of us may scoff and poo-poo the idea of controlling public television. But let me point out an example that happened here just a few days ago. There was the Public Action Council which did something that we didn't like. And this House saw fit to chop its funds so that it couldn't do it again. I would say that the same argument could be made for public television. The first time that public television exercised its independent thinking and did something we didn't like, we would be the first to retaliate to cut off their funds. I hope you think about that before you cast an 'aye' vote."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I've had my battles with the press but I'll tell you what, I'll take them anytime when it's a free press rather than one that's financed by the government. I think that...you all know that anything that is financed by the government takes the government strings. I don't want a TV system in Illinois run by a Republican



Governor or a Democrat Governor or any other Governor. And I don't want to be beholden to anybody. And I'll tell you what, they're...first place, they're unnecessary but in the second place, this is the beginning of the end of a free press subsidized by your taxpayers. You better think what you're doing here because the long range consequences are not good."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would...I would have bought that argument of that last Speaker if I hadn't seen so many who have for years subsidized the Illinois Information Service. They're your taxpayer's... taxpayer's money, they're your monies and they're used for propaganda. I would rather use those funds in a good, public information network which we have in the Chicago area. I know it does a good job. I watch it very often and I don't think in any way at all that any Governor or any of us are going to control that public media. I think it will provide good programming in comparison to the real junk that we have on TV on those networks that have the...the heavy dollars of advertising. I think it's a good Bill and I think we ought to support this Amendment to concur."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we're doing today is turning public television into government television, and understand that clearly. How many of you have watched channel 11 in Chicago and periodically they have a plea for money. I'd like to see how many of the high paid Legislators in this Body who think so strongly enough to vote for this Bill have contributed funds of their



own to public television. Put your hands up if you've contributed to Channel 11. Let's see how many of you have really done it. Yes, well I see. I'd like to see everyone of you doing it. It seems to me the same Party that just voted the abolition of the sales tax is claiming we have the money to do/^{that}is now giving some away in another area that the government doesn't belong in."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Well what I have to say about this is, this will be the beginning of another rip-off. It will just take a few more years and then we'll see it begin to happen in our country and in our state. So, I just think we should vote 'no' and stop this before it starts."

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

Schneider: "I just want to ask Representative Griesheimer what premium he got on his contribution to Channel 11. You got a frisbee?"

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

Conti: "Not to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. If this reaches 92...89 votes, I'd like a verification of the Roll Call."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think we're all aware that throughout the educational structure, especially in the common school fund, there's millions of dollars in use in educational TV. On the junior college system, we have educational TV. On the senior college system, we have educational TV. In Office of Education we have studios, technicians, directors, stars. Who are



we kidding? We're spending millions of dollars in our educational budget in educational TV. And all of you that have viewed these educational channels know that they're very worthwhile. They provide a service that the commercial television stations will never provide. I spent some of my most enjoyable hours watching educational TV and I suggest that you not be dishonest with yourself now not voting for this."

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

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the point needs to be made that as the state begins to infuse public television with state money, with taxpayer's money, the voluntary contributions are be going...are going to begin to decline. The taxpayer's are going to refuse to, on a voluntary basis, contribute to something that they think increasingly is being financed by the government. It just doesn't make sense. I think there is an issue of freedom here and I would urge certainly a 'no' vote on this issue if we want to keep public television a part of our free educational and entertainment sector."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've spoken on this subject a number of times as to the value of educational TV. I had experience with it as a classroom teacher and let me tell you that educational TV is about one of the biggest wastes of the taxpayer's money in the area of education that you can find. Let me tell you why. With the competition from commercial television and the amount of money they can pour in to a half an hour program and the money that's available



for public educational TV, is not nearly enough to make any difference. The experience of bringing educational TV into the classrooms compared to a classroom teacher is like apples and oranges. You had better put your money into other types of educational products than educational TV. And for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I vote 'no'."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise against this Bill. And I suggest to you that groups such as the Better Government Association...things such as public television are good because of their independence. They're not beholding to anybody. Now it's logical to assume that if this Bill were to go into effect and somebody was doing an investigative story into Illinois government, they could very well stop and think, 'Now wait a minute, what is Mike Madigan or what is Ted Lechowicz going to think about this story if we run it?' Why? Because they are going to have a say as to whether or not these groups get dollars. We've been very careful in recent years and cautious insofar as to how we handle the press...and the sanctity of their offices and their contacts. Why? Because it's important to maintain the first Amendment. I suggest to you that this same kind of independence is involved in this argument and I suggest you vote against it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a problem with this Bill. The problem is that the Sponsor is one whom all of us respect very much, I certainly do, and



we would want to be able to help him if we could. I mean that and I think he knows I mean that. But ask yourself, if you were a special interest group that wanted to start participating in the public trough, who would you come to to ask to sponsor your Bill? If it were me, I would go to this Sponsor because it would guarantee passage of the Bill. But don't look at it from the standpoint of the Sponsor this time. It has nothing to do with partisanship or really too much to do with government. It has a lot to do with the future of our taxpayers, the future of the viewers of public television and of public television itself. This Bill passed..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber. Timer's on."

Leinenweber: "I just stuck it on to get a verification but Representative Conti had already asked for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner. Timer's on."

Skinner: "Can't you see it now? "Upstairs, downstairs" will be about City Hall politics at 111 East Chestnut. "I, Claudius," will be about ward politics in an inner city ward. The "Duchess" of Duke Street will be about the Everly Sisters. "Lord Peter Whimsley" will be about... will be called the Velvet Hammer. And mighty... Monty Python's Flying Circus will be Langhorn Bond's faulty Pylons. Frankly, I prefer the British imports."

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

Bowman: "Not in response, Ladies and Gentlemen. I see a lot of my brethren and colleagues up there voting... voting green who I ordinarily vote with on civil libertarian matters. It seems to me, however, that this Bill should not..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "My mistake, Sir, please continue."



Bowman: "Thank you. This Bill should not be sent to the Governor's desk because where the money flows, the control will surely follow. I think the analogy that was raised a short time before is entirely appropriate that...that we defeated the appropriation for the Governor's Office of Manpower Consumer Services Division because we didn't like what one of their...funding entities did. And I think if all we need is to have one program in public television lambasting the Illinois General Assembly that we would see a similar fight on this floor at some future date. And I, for one, would not like to put ourselves in that kind of a posture that is why I am not voting to concur in this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 62 'nays', 13 recorded as 'present'. And a request for a verification has been made. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, seek recognition?"

Leinenweber: "Mr. Conti wishes me to take...make the verification request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me. Elmer...yeah, that's correct. Now do you want to take it, Will...Bill?"

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I'll take it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right."

Leinenweber: "I'll make the request for the verification in lieu of Mr. Conti."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Capuzi. Virginia Frederick. McAuliffe. Molloy. Peters. Robbins. Schlickman. E.G. Steele. Sumner. And, Watson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed to verify the affirmative vote."



Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bradley. Braun. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reilly. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Vinson. Vitek. Von Boeckman. White. Wikoff. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Harry, any questions of the affirmative vote? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Beatty: "Verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave to be verified? Leave granted. Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Deuster."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Deuster..I've just seen the Gentleman on the floor. Come out where ever you are."

Leinenweber: "He's not around. Mr. Telcser."

Unknown: "You moved him didn't you."

Leinenweber: "Oh, well take him off, will you please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm looking for him. Mr. Deuster."

Leinenweber: "Come on, he isn't coming."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's not be impatient. Let's give the Gentleman some time."

Leinenweber: "We have plenty of time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Deuster. Is that him? No. Kindly remove him."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Telcser."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Telcser in the Chamber? Remove him. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne. Kindly record Mr. Van Duyne as 'aye'."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Bradley."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Bradley in the Chamber? Yeah, he's in the Chamber. He's here."

Leinenweber: "All right. Mr. Brummer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummer. He's here."

Leinenweber: "Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Christensen. Mr. Getty. There he is. Mr. Christensen is in his chair."

Leinenweber: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson. Mr. Dawson. Is Mr. Dawson in the Chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in the Chamber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Dunn is here."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is here."

Leinenweber: "Where? Where is he?"

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

Leinenweber: "Hanahan."



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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan is in the Chamber."

Leinenweber: "Where?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right here."

Leinenweber: "All right. Mr. Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane. Hello, Doug. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Kane in the Chamber? But Mr. Ewell is. Remove him."

Leinenweber: "Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino is here."

Leinenweber: "Where?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "In his chair."

Leinenweber: "That's a surprise. McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McClain is here."

Leinenweber: "McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McGrew in the Chamber? Yeah, he's here."

Leinenweber: "O'Brien."

Speaker Lechowicz: "O'Brien is here."

Leinenweber: "Patrick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Patrick is here."

Leinenweber: "Rea."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Rea in the Chamber? Remove him."

Leinenweber: "Schisler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schisler is in the Chamber."

Leinenweber: "Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sharp is in the Chamber."

Leinenweber: "Von Boeckman."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is here."

Leinenweber: "Ronan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ronan. He's here."

Leinenweber: "Johnson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right there. Mr. Johnson. He's here."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You...you already called him and he
was in his chair and he's still there."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Wikoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Wikoff is here...right in the center
aisle."

Leinenweber: "Reilly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Reilly is here. Are you concluded, Sir?"

Leinenweber: "Just about but I think my staff here is
working on another one."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Phil, you got anymore for him? All
right, what's the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Leinenweber: "Stearney."

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

Leverenz: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'."

Leinenweber: "Ropp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record Mr. Peters as 'aye'."

Leinenweber: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Mr. Kane back on. Okay, what's
the count, Mr. Clerk? Put Mr. Telcser back on.
On this question there are 93 'ayes'..."

Clerk O'Brien: "62 'noes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...62 'noes' and the House does concur
with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2283. This
Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is
hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Lake,
Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek
recognition?"



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by which House Bill 2283 passed, I move to reconsider that vote, 2283."

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

Stuffle: "I move to table that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the motion lie on the table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, opposed...the Gentleman's motion carries. House Bill 2540. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Chair, I guess. Earlier you had announced to this Body that we were going to break at eight o'clock."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Ryan: "It is now eight o'clock. I have several Members gone as you can see and you do too. If that's the announced schedule, are you going to keep it or what's the...what's the program?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is extremely well taken. The announcement was made that the Conference Committees would meet at eight o'clock, from the hour eight to nine. The Speaker is in the process of checking whether the Senate conferees are available for a meeting because they did...they did adjourn until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock. We'll try to get back to you...I'll try to get back to you immediately after Mr. McMaster's Bill."

Ryan: "I...I...thanks, Mr. Speaker. Only I just want you to know, I'm not asking for anything I just want to know what the intent of the Chair is so the Members can be informed. I'm not asking for a break, I just want to...know what the program is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It will be...it will be my intent to go through Mr. McMaster's three Bills and stand in



recess until nine o'clock so the Conference Committees can meet."

Ryan: "It'll be nine...through with his Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me."

Ryan: "It'll be nine o'clock by the time you get through with his Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't believe they're that controversial."

Ryan: "Okay, fine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And hopefully by then the Speaker will come back with an answer for us. Yes, now we're going to stand in recess. House Bill 2540. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2540 was a Bill that deleted the requirement to have cards of instructions for polling places. It...we...in the original Bill, it deleted the printing of the cards but we inadvertently forgot the posting requirement. So the Senate Amendment #1 merely deletes the requirement that cards be posted. Since they are no longer printed, you will no longer post them. I would move concurrence in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2540. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2540. House Bill 2548."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2548 is the legislation, rather extensive, that we passed back in May, I believe, that would have the state concurring with



all of the requirements of the Federal Surface Mining Act of 1977. As you all know, we must, by Federal law, comply with the Federal Act, Public law 95-87. It is very comprehensive legislation. There are two Senate Amendments to it. Senate Amendment #1 is language that would permit us to operate our local program...Illinois program in the event that portions of the Federal Act were found to be unconstitutional or were modified or changed by a court action in Washington. I don't imagine you people know it but this Federal Act is under heavy court pressure in Washington by several law suits. So the Senate Amendment #2 is language that would say that mining operations on ^{prime} farm land may be issued only if the Department of Mines and Minerals also finds in writing that the operator of the mine has a technological capability to restore such mined area within a reasonable length of time and can meet the soil reconstruction standards. It also changes the date of the Surface Mine and Land Conservation Reclamation Act to 79 rather than 77. I would move concurrence in these two Senate Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2548? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 'ayes', 0 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2548. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2740. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We'll have to wait until the..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "You can explain it."

McMaster: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2740 is another companion Bill to the Surface Mining Law. The Federal Act, PL95-77, provides for a tax on all coal mines, a severance tax that will be redistributed to the states who are in compliance with the Federal Act for the purpose of reclaiming what we call 'abandoned mined lands'. The purpose of this is, of course, to reclaim lands that are polluting first our streams and such as this. The Federal Act, which I do not necessarily agree with on this basis, permits reclamation of privately owned land. We require in our state law that there would be a lien upon that land if it's privately owned and we go in and reclaim with the money sent to us by the Feds. And the purpose of the Senate Amendment #1 is correct grammatical errors. Senate Amendment #2 provides by rule for the accumulation of interest on the amount secured by the lien that we would put on private property that was reclaimed with the money we received from the Federal people under this Act. I would concur in both Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2740."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tom, does this relate to strip mining or is this abandoned mines or..."

McMaster: "Glen, the abandoned mined lands part pertains to all mining operations, whether it be underground or surface. In other words, if you have a slag pile left from an underground mine, we could use the money from this to prevent the pollution caused by that slag pile. In fact, we have had a couple of operations in effect on just that one thing where these slag piles were polluting streams."



Schneider: "And are the strip mines, that I see so often, are those still owned by private companies...the strip mines."

McMaster: "This varies, Glen. In most cases the surface mined lands are probably still owned by a coal company of some sort. There's been little attempt by the surface mines in the past, I would say ten years, to sell any of their surface mining operations, after they are through with it, back to private individuals. So..."

Schneider: "Would they...they would qualify for some of the Federal money that you said...Federal money could be used to reclaim lands owned by private..."

McMaster: "Let me point out, there is a very strong advisory council before reclamation can be done upon any land. As I said, the Federal law provides, which we have been against I guess, for reclaiming privately owned lands which gets into what you're talking about where it could be privately owned by a mining company. But this is one of the reasons why we are attempting... if we are going to go into this program, Glen, which I think we should, it amounts some seven or eight million dollars per year probably that will come back to the State of Illinois for that purpose. If we're going to go into it on privately owned land, we want protection to regain what it cost us to do that. And that's the purpose of this part of the Act."

Schneider: "It seems like a good Amendment and a good Bill. I'll vote 'aye'."

McMaster: "I move adoption of the Senate Amendments and concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2740? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk



will take the record. On this question there's 156 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2740. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Speaker informed me to ask...to tell the Membership that he checked with the Senate, there will not be any Conference Committee meetings tonight because the Senate Members are not available. It's the intent of the Chair to try to clean up the rest of Calendar. And hopefully, with your indulgence, we will do that this evening. I really don't know how late we're going to be going. If I were you I would order some food now. And the next Bill will be 2569. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know why you people are so intent on trying to railroad this kind of Bill through at this hour. You did announce that we were going to break at eight o'clock. In response to the Minority Leader, you said that after Mr. McMaster's Bills we would break. People have left looking for Conference Committees. People that weren't on Conference Committees have left for dinner. This is a Bill that is highly controversial. It's a Bill that people are very much interested in. I don't know why you want to sneak this through under the cover of night. Why can't you either schedule the Bill for sometime when it should be called or wait until tomorrow morning when a full Membership is here? This is uncalled for, Mr. Speaker. It's beneath you. It's an insult to the dignity of this House. I don't know why...why the Democratic Party insists on running rough shod over people. If you've got the votes, call the Bill...call the Bill at a decent hour and vote it



up or down. But why do you have to resort to this kind of subterfuge, this kind of dirty pool, this kind of rotten treatment of the Minority. This is no way to operate this House, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...Mr. Collins, I put the lights on a little bit brighter for you so it is not on the cover of darkness."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I don't care about lights. Turn them off and we'll talk in the dark. This is..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well that's the way you operate."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you ought..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I'll support Representative Phil Collins right after this Bill but he...we're really not sneaking this Bill. As you see, as soon as he called that Bill, the TV cameras adjusted their cameras. Right? There they are. In fact, they've got them trained right on you, Phil. There's nothing go on secretly. We're going to do this right in the open and let the people know whether we want a corporate personal property replacement or not. It's right here in front of God and everybddy and the TV cameras are there to show the world. After that, then I'll join you to adjourn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, John. Do you request the TV cameras to be turned on?"

Matijevich: "Yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "We had better clear the vote because they will really fall out of the balconies."

Cullerton: "I just wanted to inform Mr. Collins that I think I have his impersonation down finally and I'll..."



you'll see it again tomorrow night."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard so much last night about the Party on the other side of the aisle being the Party of the people. Now there have been only about three significant Bills in this whole Session. And this is one of the very most important Bills, as far as I'm concerned, the replacement of the personal property tax. We've been waiting for this Bill for the last nine years in this state. Now you have the audacity to call this Bill when there are Conference Committees going on. You made the announcement that there's...we're going to break right after the Conference Committees for an hour."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Conti, please, I said..."

Conti: "Now, Mr. Speaker, if you're the Party of the people..."

CONTINUED ON PAGE 263



Speaker Lechowicz: "Now please, Mr. Conti, just for the record...if you'd check the record, I stated quite explicitly that the Conference Committees were supposedly meeting between the hours of 8:00 and 9:00. I made the mention of the fact that the Speaker was checking with the Senate because the Senate did adjourn and that we would continue with the workload of the House until the Speaker got back and checked the availability of the Senate Members. The Speaker came back, I made the announcement we'd continue with the work schedule of the House. We completed Mr. McMasters Bills, the next Bill on the agenda is 2569. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I request a Republican Conference in Room 118 immediately."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe that 2569 was called. We're in the process of having 2569 called. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Now, Mr. Speaker, you've been here a lot longer than I have and you know that that's always been granted. I don't care whether we've had conferences in the middle of Bills, discussions and debates, I asked, as the Minority Leader of the Illinois House, to have a conference with my Members right now."

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

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think some of the previous speakers were correct..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. McPike, I'll try to get you a little order. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I want a Republican Conference. This is total abuse of the Chair..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now, Mr. Ryan, please..."

Ryan: "Now wait just a minute. Now I've got a chance to talk,



you be quiet. You've sat up there long enough...you fellas have raked this around...so everybody...you tell everybody to leave at 8:00 and now you've got us down here where people that want to vote against this aren't here. You talk about Conferences...this is a totally rigged situation and I don't know what the hell you're afraid of...of the Republicans going down to have a conference before you call this Bill. Now what is...what are you afraid of?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm not afraid of anything, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well then give me a Republican Conference, I'm entitled to it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How much time do you need?"

Ryan: "I want a half an hour. I don't know how you can deny it. Get the real Speaker up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well I believe that the Bill was already on the board, Sir, and we're in the process of a Concurrence. Mr...Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think some of the previous speakers were correct. We have been waiting 9 years for this Bill and I think it's about time that we address ourselves to it. We have two days left in this Session of the General Assembly. We have to have a replacement for the Corporate Personal Property Tax. This is the only Bill left and I think it's time now, at this late hour, that we finally address ourselves to the issue. This Bill was debated at length before it left the House. I think the discussions have lasted about an hour and a half and so I think there's no point in talking it to death. I would like to review the changes in the Bill as it came back from the Senate. As you will recall, when the Bill left the House the Corporate Tax Rate was at 3%. We have reduced that from 3% to 2.85. The utilities



invested capital tax...as it left the House was at .75 and we have increased that to .8. These two changes will result in a net reduction of approximately 12 million dollars. We have further changed the effective date of this Act from August 1, 1979 and thereafter to July 1, 1979 and thereafter. We estimate that this will bring in approximately 519.8 million dollars. The more...the more that we have discussed this with the Governor's people, the more they have agreed with us. They are now... they are now saying that it will take a rate of at least 2.5 percent and that will have to be retroactive to January 1 of 1979. We can raise the necessary money at a rate of 2.85% effective July 1, 1979. According to the Governor's proposal industry in Illinois would pay approximately 206 million dollars more in this calendar year than under this proposal. This addresses itself to all the needs of local governments. It is an equitable tax, it is a fair replacement, it does everything the Constitution requires. I think it's time that we quit the rhetoric on this and vote on it. With that I would move that the House concur with Senate Amendments 3, 13 and 14."

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

"The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a culmination of two years work by the House Revenue Committee, which last year passed out 2418 to replace the Personal Property Tax. That Bill passed the House of Representatives, it was not called in the State Senate. This year the House Revenue Committee and a Subcommittee under Representative Mugalian, worked hard on fulfilling our Constitutional obligation to replace the



the Personal Property Tax. We came up with a good Bill. The Democratic Task Force on Personal Property Tax Replacement, which I serve as Chairman, endorsed this concept. The Task Force Bill was approved by editorial comments in most major papers in the State of Illinois. We passed a Bill to the State Senate at a 3% rate, a 3% income tax on corporations. The State Senate, in order to accommodate the Governor... and I was in on some of those meetings with the Governor's people, reduced that rate to 2.85% in order to take care of the problem that business had in the business climate of this state. The Bill is now in a shape where it meets the demand of Governor Thompson that we go below the 3% rate. We went below the 3% rate to accommodate Governor Thompson and his business contributors. We took care of his contributors. We lowered the rate for him from 3% down to 2.85%. The Bill is in good shape now. The Senate Amendment, for a change, even improves the House Bill and I support the Gentleman from Madison County who's urged that we concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2569. And finally... and finally afford the relief that local governments and schools want in replacing the Personal Property Tax and making sure that our schools and local governments have sufficient revenue to carry on. And I move...and I second the motion of Representative McPike to concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2569. It's long overdue."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition against this Bill. Last night, or two nights ago your side of the aisle passed legislation that is going to hurt business and industry



even more. There's no question that we have to replace the Personal Property Tax. But at the same ^{and} time, you don't have to drive business/industry out of Illinois. Just in today's Springfield paper the Caterpillar Tractor Company is going to leave the State of Illinois for the new plant. You want to know why? And I quote from the newspaper, 'The General Assembly has been considering how to replace the defunct Personal Corporate Personal Property Tax with new Corporate Taxes. Under the old Personal Property Tax, the Chairman of the Board said, his company paid 3.3 million dollars. With the latest proposal by the Democrats which would increase and impose an additional 2.58 percentage Corporate Income Tax, Caterpillars tax liabilities would increase to over 15 million dollars a year.' What do you want to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr...excuse me, Mr. Simms. Kindly give the Gentleman your attention. Would the Membership kindly be in your own seats? Please, this is a very important matter. Please continue, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "This is a good illustration of where a tax has increased from 3.3 million dollars a year up to 15 million dollars a year that you're going to force a company to go over to another state and expand their plant. The provisions in this legislation do not conform to what the Governor's Task Force did. This legislation in no way reflects the type of Personal Property Tax Replacement called for by the Constitution. This far exceeds what is needed. This is a tax that will be overabundant. It's going to be repressive to business and industry and it's going to do the very opposite of what it was intending to do. It's going to drive business, industry and, yes people, jobs from the State of Illinois. And the



Democratic Party, if you pass this Bill, are going to be responsible for the loss of thousands and thousands of jobs in Illinois, just like you did with Workman's Comp. and Unemployment Compensation in 1975. I urge that you vote 'no' against this Concurrence."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Minority Spokesman on the Revenue Committee I have taken part in the study of the replacement of the Personal Property Tax. And I appreciate this opportunity to discuss this important measure here tonight. In assessing House Bill 2569 I think it is important that we put aside ideologies, differences in regard to whatever measures have been set forth in this Session. The time restraints facing this legislation and the fiscal integrity of local government will not allow us in this Legislature to not resolve this problem. We have only this vehicle left to do it with. But as responsible Legislators I think we must be aware of the content of House Bill 2569. This Bill is to be a replacement tax for the Corporate Personal Property Tax. Is it a replacement tax or is it a new tax? Is it an opportunity, a once in a lifetime opportunity for the other side of the aisle to skirt the 8 to 5 ratio which holds our corporate and our private and personal income tax together in this state. I believe that the comments that have been made earlier in the negotiations prove that the other side of the aisle wants to add an additional tax to business in this state. The Constitution states that any replacement tax should provide revenues equal to the amount of loss to the local districts. While



early discussions debated extensions vs. collections, by early last month both sides had agreed that the range of replacement dollars was from 468 million, the Republican figure, to 533 million, the Democrat figure. You would think with only a 65 million dollar difference that we would be able to agree on a final total. However, numerous meetings have been held between the Democrats and the Republicans with the end that there has been no compromise on the Democratic part. The meager 1.5% reduction in ^{Rate} Corporate Income Tax/in the Senate Amendment only allows for an 18 million dollar reduction. This is only 5% of the total raise. But when you consider that they have upped the utility rates and for all of you who are representatives of the people, realize that this must be passed on, this would recoup approximately 10 million dollars. If the Republicans had agreed to increase their figure from 468 million by 1.5%, such as you have reduced yours, we would have increased it only 7 million dollars. And we would be accused of making virtually no change. Yet the same percentage reduction offered by the Democratic Party Members in this Legislature is being touted as a major concession. What compromises have the Republicans made? They have made many. We have accepted your distribution, which puts 52% of the replacement money into Cook County. We have upped the amount of money from 468 million, which is the top amount anybody could justify, to 500 million. We have agreed that there should be no cap on the Income Tax money collected under this. We have taken out all the special provisions for the large corporations. And yet these compromises have not been enough. In our meetings with the Governor he has pointed out that he believes a 2.5 rate



for corporations, 1.5 for partnerships and .75 for utilities is a fair and equitable amount. By this we could pay out next July, starting the tax on January 1, 509 million dollars. But in your version, with your tax at a higher rate but starting this July, you could only pay out 353 million dollars. In the 2nd, 3rd and 4th years of the Governor's proposal and the ones that we have adopted here, we would rise from 509 to 519 to 563 million, 693...619 million in the 4th year. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the most adequate growth, far beyond that which we could have endured or received under the old Personal Property Tax. In fact, by 1988 the Democrat proposal will raise over 533 million dollars more than the Corporate Personal Property Tax. It will be collecting over 1 billion, 100 million dollars a year. Now we talk about the business climate of this state and I have heard Members of the Democratic Party say, 'We have one of the most favorable Income Taxes.' We do. But when we add this new rate, Gentlemen and Ladies of this House, we will fall from 46 among those with Corporate Income Taxes to 17. And we will be still #1 in the Corporate...in the tax on corporations for Workmen's Comp. An argument that Illinois' rate is so favorable, which it won't be after this Bill passes, but to consider that...only this...is unrealistic, for Illinois will continue to be one of the #1 taxing states in the Union. Let's send a message to business that we want them to stay in Illinois. Let's nonconcur and put this into a Conference Committee so that we can work out a compromise. Otherwise, we are faced... you are promised a Governor's Veto of this Bill and we will be back here in a Special Session. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, our choice is clear. If we



concur we get a veto. If we nonconcur and reach a reasonable agreement we can be out of here on time, we can take care of local government and we can send that Message to business, 'We want you in Illinois.' I ask my Republican colleagues, I ask the Democratic Members of this House to join with me in voting 'no' on this concurrence. Let's get this matter solved now. Let's don't come back in July or August."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard an awful lot of figures about what the rate on the Corporate Income Tax will be if we add 2.8 percent to the present 4 percent. And we've said, or we've heard from the Republican side of the aisle that this will be an intolerable burden upon corporations."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Kane, would the conferences kindly subside. Give the Gentleman your attention, please. Please continue."

Kane: "We've heard from the Republican side of the aisle that that would be an intolerable burden upon corporations. Well if you look at the advertisement that the Department of Business and Economic Development has put out on the burden of taxation on corporations in Illinois, you'll see that if you look at the administrations own rhetoric and their own advertisement that the amount of taxation on corporations in Illinois is one of the lowest in the country. And if we add this 2.8% onto corporate income we'll have a total rate on corporate income of 6.8%. Now the previous speaker said that that would make us 17th in the country. But he hasn't read his own administrations propoganda and that puts us 22nd in the country. But what he did not say is that there are only 5 states in the country that do not tax corporate personal property. So that



not only will we be 22nd in the country in taxing corporate income, we will be one of 5 states that do not tax corporate personal property at all. Which means that with this tax we will have one of the lowest burdens...tax burdens on corporations in the country. So much for the first myth that we've heard from the other side. The second myth that we've heard from the other side is that the package that we are voting on tonight is going to yield too much money. That this is an additional tax and that the package proposed by the Governor and by the Republicans will be sufficient. Well let me tell you that the things that the program that the Republicans are looking at, they're looking at a 2.5% rate. They want to make that tax retroactive to this past January and what they are saying is that by next July their package will raise 509 million dollars and that will be sufficient. But what they don't say is that that's 18 months of taxes and they're trying to say that 18 months of taxes will replace one year of taxation on the Corporate Personal Property Tax. Now what's going to happen in the second year? What's going to happen in the second year is that the yield from this you're only going to get 12 months and if you only have a 2.5% rate and you collect it for only 12 months instead of 18 months you're going to get your yield down from a quarter to a third. And that means that your units of local government are going to be short on their budgets by 25 to 30%. And then what's going to happen? Who's going to make up the difference? The other thing that the Governor and the administration and the Republican Party have refused to put in their Bill, they have refused to say that they will hold units of local government harmless, that they will



guarantee to every unit of local government in this state that they will get as much in the replacement tax next year as they collected in the Corporate Personal Property Tax this year. That was nowhere in House Bill 2700. The Governor's Office has refused to say that they will guarantee that each unit of government will get its revenue replaced. Why? Because they know, they know in their hearts that there is not enough revenue in their program to guarantee that those units of local government will be held harmless. The other thing that we've heard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Give the Gentleman some attention. Please, continue, Sir."

Kane: "The other thing that we've heard is that Illinois has a terrible business climate. And that Caterpillar is leaving Illinois to go to Indiana or some other state because they're going to be socked with a terrible tax. Well if they go to Indiana they're going to be socked, not with a Corporate Income Tax, but with a value added tax. And do you know what that's going to do to Caterpillar's tax liability? What they're saying is that the 2.8% tax rate in Illinois in this replacement package is going to cost them 15 million dollars next year. You know what that means? That means that their profits this year were 535 million dollars before taxes. And I would say that any corporation that can net 535 million dollars in Illinois and then complain about the business climate in Illinois is just trying to fool us. What they're looking for is a loophole, what they're looking for is something to save them 20 million dollars in the next two years. They don't want to...if you look at their assessed valuation, their assessed valuation is very low and



that's why they've been able to escape the burden that they should have been bearing for the last several years. In summary, I would say that this is a fair Bill, it's adequate, it's no more than adequate and we should concur in these Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very, very briefly, if we pass this Bill tonight I would urge the Speaker to immediately and forthwith surrender to Wisconsin, Mississippi, Kansas and Indiana. We have no right to make war, we've created our own problem."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been hearing about the business climate in Illinois until I'm sick of it. Let me tell you that the business climate in Illinois today is very good. The sun is shining in Illinois and the sun will continue to shine in Illinois if this Bill goes to the Governor's desk. Now, the contention is that this is going to be a new tax on the...on businesses. Well let me remind you that businesses have been paying a Corporate Personal Property Tax all these years. Now are the Republicans trying to tell us that businesses have not been paying their fair share under the Corporate Personal Property Tax? Well that's probably true. I'm glad that the Republicans are finally acknowledging that, because we know that in Cook County only about 20 corporations have paid over half the tax and that's because a lot of them are getting off the hook. Let me tell you something about this replacement tax. It is more fair than a personal property tax because it is linked to the ability to pay. If you don't have the profits, you don't pay the tax. If you have



the profits you do pay the tax. Let me talk about the amount of money that needs to be raised. The numbers that have been thrown around here, the 530 million dollar price tag on the original Bill as it went over to the Senate was based on Economic and Fiscal Commission projections about revenues. But let me tell you, if you take the Governor's budget book, and I ask everyone of you if you've got one in your desk, to pick it up and look on page 292. If you look at the numbers that the Governor's projecting for corporate income and you apply the 3% rate that we sent over to the Senate and the .75 rate on utilities that we sent over to the Senate, our package is going to raise 507 million dollars. Now that's a lot less money than everyone has been talking about. We can't afford to back down very much. Those school districts need that money. We're only replacing the money that was collected. We're only replacing the money that was collected. The Governor knows, the Governor knows that we can't back down. The Governor's only reason...the only reason that we had to rearrange those numbers, and you know it on the other side of the aisle, the Governor politically couldn't sign a 3% rate. It's pure politics, Ladies and Gentlemen, he was blocked in. He has a constituency to respond to and his constituency isn't our constituency. His constituency is big business. He can't go back to them and say, 'I had to sign a 3% rate.' So he's got to sign a small rate. Okay, we juggle the numbers and give him a smaller rate that raises the same amount of money. That's fine. I want you to know, that amount of money is the bottom line for the school districts. That's what they need to operate, that's what's been collected, that's what we've got to give them. We've given the Governor his political 'thought', he can sign



that Bill and go back to business and say, 'I gave you a break.' So let's give it to the Governor."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady has moved the previous question.

All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', opposed. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, to close."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't understand why this should be a partisan issue. And it really surprised me that Representative Griesheimer would try to make it a military issue. I...I would just like to answer Field Marshal Griesheimer before continuing. I don't think it's wise to surrender to Wisconsin after we have a 6.85 tax rate when Wisconsin has a 7.9 tax rate in addition to a Corporate Personal Property Tax. I don't think we should surrender under those conditions. I think that we're going to have to face the responsibility of serving in the General Assembly and replacing a tax that is needed and necessary for the operation of local government. We have come to the very bottom line on this. Our tax rate, according to the Governor's budget book, raises approximately 510 million dollars. According to Economic and Fiscal Commission it raises 519 million dollars. Everybody likes to talk about the fancy graphs that we've seen in the newspapers and the graphs put out by the Taxpayers Federation, they all assume a 10% growth or a 12% growth. The Governor's budget book calls for a 5% decrease next year. Economic and Fiscal Commission reports that came out yesterday calls for a .6% decrease next year. Where is the growth? It isn't there but the school districts still must operate. The answer then to the local



school districts either is to give them the money necessary to operate or to raise local real estate taxes. Now we all know who is very well represented in Springfield, the corporations. The corporation lobbyists, the corporation executives. They not only have access to the Legislators on the floor, in Committee, but they have private access to the Governor's Office. They call meetings in the Governor's Office. They threaten in the Governor's Office. There's only one word for it and it's 'corporate blackmail'. The corporations are not going to flee Illinois because we have a 6.85% tax rate, because we're 20th from the top, because we're only 1 of 5 states that will no longer have a Corporate Personal Property Tax. But they will try to blackmail this Legislature and the Executive Branch of Government to get every special favor that they possibly can. It's blackmail, pure and simple, and I don't think that we should or will give into it. We're going to have to go home now and tell the people that we represent, and that is the individual taxpayers, that we've tried to help them out. We've looked at the figures, we've come up with a fair tax and now we've given a chance for the schools to operate and local governments to operate at the rate they deserve. I might add just one thing. We like to listen to the rhetoric from different politicians that claim that we're trying to hurt big business. The Governor's package and our package at this point are one-third of 1% apart. But the Governor adds 6 months to his, 6 months that will cost corporations 206 million dollars. I would say that the Governor and his package is the one that is trying to slap it in the face of corporations this year and that it's the Democratic package, it should be



the non-partisan package that is trying to replace a tax at the same time that we protect the homeowner. With that I would move that we concur in Senate Amendments #3, 13 and 14 to House Bill 2569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #2, 13 and 14 to House Bill 2569. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'...the board is incorrect, it's Senate Amendments #3, 13 and 14. Kindly change your Calendars to Senate Amendment 3, 13 and 14. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Schuneman: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to point out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that you haven't been listening. Ever since 1975 the citizens of this state have been sending us a message and telling us to quit browbeating business. Now you didn't listen in '75 when you had 101 Members over there. You didn't listen in 1977 when you had 94 Members over there and you're not listening this time. You're not allowing changes in Workmen's Compensation, like you all know should be made. You are also passing tonight a personal property tax replacement Bill that costs 30 million dollars more than it needs to cost. Just a day or so ago you passed a Bill that's going to cost business an additional 180 million dollars. Now what do you think business is going to say next year when they take a look at the General Assembly under the leadership of the Democrat Party and ask themselves..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder. The timer is on."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't have any prepared remarks, but I'm going to address my remarks tonight to this side of the aisle. It's



become a partisan issue and I think we ought to stop being partisan when it comes to the business climate in Illinois. How many of you on this side went through a strike, got good wages, good benefits from a good employer and then soon thereafter guys with 19 year olds didn't know whether they had a job or whether they'd ever go back to work or not? That's been continued in Peoria for many, many years. How many of you had plants left your area with 800 or 1,000 and how many more are contemplating going? And I'm not talking about Caterpillar, I'm talking about the smaller ones. And how many of you can point out, where is the new business that's come to your community? We don't have it in Peoria. We thank the Lord that we've got Caterpillar and the 25 or 30,000 U.A.W. Members that make a good living for their families. And I'm saying to you here and now that if you want business in this community, my community, your community, in the State of Illinois to prosper so that your Membership, and yes, I'm talking about the laboring people here, McPike, Giorgi, and all the rest of you that are with labor...I'm with labor, I was a B.A. for 8 years and I want to protect those people as I did then. But I'm telling you right now, if we don't send this to a Conference Committee and make the business climate a better climate, we're not going to see business growing in Illinois and we're going to lose business to Indiana, Wisconsin, Alabama, and yes, those nonunion states, Gentlemen. Those people that you don't like. We're going to see all these nice businesses going down to the Southern part of the country. And if you can live with that, fine, I can't. I want business to stay in Illinois, to come to Illinois, and yes, I want Caterpillar to stay in Illinois. I vote..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote. The timer is on. Kindly give Mr. Robbins your attention."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hate to say this but the Union Members on the other side of the aisle should think of their families and the people that work for them and the people that pay the union dues. We had a strike in our town of ARTEX. The employees were forced by the Union leadership because they said it cost so much to make their product to take a settlement of almost starvation wages...because their own people said that they could not do that. A tool and die maker at that factory gets \$6.80 an hour. Now that's set up by the Union. Over in Indiana they pay \$8.30 an hour to the same man for doing the same jobs. Now, why? And in Artex...Artex has moved and set up a plant in Mark..."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Gentleman from Sangamon was telling us how much money the Illinois Corporations make. I would tell him that he can buy the Wall Street Journal and it will list the stock there and he's quite welcome to buy any of the stocks and make all that great money he's talking about, because all these companies are owned by the public and I suggest he do it... A couple of days ago I suggested we send the Gentleman from McHenry and the Gentleman from Winnebago as our infiltration process but I suggest we take this Roll Call and send them by two's...37 states and maybe we can destroy them and get the unfavorable labor climate we're getting here."



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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I explain my vote because I've heard so many bleeding hearts about the corporations. One thing we must remember that many of the corporations, many of the corporations were not paying their share of the tax as it was prior. Those with hidden inventories were cheating and there was no doubt about it and that's what brought the split between the various business enterprises, the...those which had the retail inventories that were so open...the steel industry that had the inventories that were visible. So I wouldn't have... I wouldn't think that any of you would bleed for them. But most important we are now at the eve when something must be done. The Governor told the Senate, 'Get under 3%.' And they did get under 3%. I would..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers. The timer is on."

Borchers: "I'm going to explain it just like everybody else. All I have to say is, ask yourself one question. 'Why have we lost a quarter of a million jobs in the last 2 years from Illinois?' I...just answer the question. There's got to be a reason. Well think about it, that's all I want to point out to you. And also think about one other thing, that the dividends you're worrying about go to a lot of old people and a lot of people who have to live off that. So, again, think about it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I don't quite understand why we're spending all of our time



talking about the business climate. House Bill 2569 is a Constitutional responsibility that this Legislature is finally, after 9 years, facing. The responsibility is to replace the revenues lost by the abolition of the Corporate Personal Property Tax. That is our responsibility. It seems to me that House Bill 2569 does exactly that. There is a good argument that can be made that we should have based our sense of revenues lost on the extended passes, extensions of the Corporate Personal Property Tax. As Representative Matijevich pointed out, we never did collect the monies that in fact were due under the Corporate Personal Property Tax. We worked very hard to find a fair replacement. It seems to me, when we're talking about a Governor's estimate of 468 million dollars, ours at 533, the compromise we've reached sits well within any definition of revenues lost. There is a range, we've met that range, it seems to me we've met it responsibly. Another issue that's been raised is the distribution of the revenues under this new tax, whether Cook is getting more than it ought...whether downstate is being...being treated unfairly... It's impossible to trace, in the imposition of a new tax, each dollar to its final destination. It seems to me here, as with the question, 'What counts as revenues lost?', we've done a good job, a fair job, a reasonable job of trying to meet what is in fact the mandate of our 1970 Constitution. I urge more green lights on that board. This is not a partisan issue. It is a mandate imposed upon us by the people of the state to re..."

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

Hudson: "The point is made, Mr. Speaker, we have a Constitutional



responsibility to replace this tax. Certainly we do. But how do we replace it, in what manner and with what? It's like we replace our shoes now and then, but we don't replace...we take a size 9 we don't replace it with a size 20 and that's what we're doing here when we do this. We're replacing this tax with something that shouldn't be done. And, Mr. Chairman, if this gets above 79 I'm going to ask for verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "89...I'll take 89."

Hudson: "89 votes I'll ask verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing has already requested that, Sir. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for 11 years I've served in this Body and I've heard the other side of the aisle crying crocodile tears for jobs in this State of Illinois. Let me tell you, each and everyone of you voting for this Concurrence should file immediately for a Work Comp...claim for partial loss of hearing. You haven't been listening to the people of the state. You talk about jobs. This is not going to do anything to the jobs. We must generate and retain jobs. This type of Bill is going to drive jobs right out of the state and if this is what you want, you vote for this Concurrence and then walk all the way back to your homes and explain it to your constituents."

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

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I served on the Task Force on the Democratic side to put this together. I don't think we're that far apart from the Governor and I don't think we're at all far apart for being fair. Tonight I am proud to be a Democrat,



I'm proud to stand here and and stand up for the people who are going to suffer the burden of additional taxes if we don't put this through in this version or a very similar version. This is the only game in town and to the Republicans who say they would be willing to take 2 and a half percent of something, I say this, If this Bill is vetoed I'll bet you you're back here looking for a lot less than that."

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

Schuneman: "I beg your pardon?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Explain your vote, Sir... Do you want to explain your vote?"

Schuneman: "No, Sir, I've already explained my vote."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that several items that have been mentioned tonight in debate ought to be placed into perspective. First of all, it should be recalled that this Bill arose out of a Task Force of this House under the leadership of the Majority Leader and the Speaker of the House with a broad cross section of all of the Members on this side of the aisle. This Bill was sent over to the Senate and figures that were appreciably higher than those that have come in this Concurrence Amendment. I think the record should show that these 3 Amendments from the Senate in fact give a windfall to corporations in the first 10 years of 175 million dollars by lowering from 3% to 2.85. But more importantly these Amendments will in fact allow them to declare on their State Income Tax another windfall of approximately 14 million dollars each year. So if you



consider in the aggregate, in 10 years alone, just with these Senate Amendments that we're asked to concur on, we're giving them a windfall of 310 million dollars over 10 years. I think it's time that we cease and desist from the kind of chicanery and double dealings that are so emanated from the second floor and this chamber. And I think it's time that the people of Illinois and Members of the Press Corps recognize, this is a second night in a row when this side of the aisle has saw fit to be responsive and responsible to the needs of the citizens of the State of Illinois. The end result..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, the Speaker of the House, Speaker Redmond:" "

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is rare, indeed, that I stand to address this Body. And that has been the history of my 10 terms in this House. I happen to believe that this issue is the one that puts the General Assembly on trial. It's the one that's our greatest test. And I want to tell you, that under the
Leader
suggestion of the Majority/and the participation of the Members of the Democratic side and the participation of some of the brightest Members of the Senate, we forged a package that met all of the requirements for the replacement of the Corporate Personal Property Tax. The big issues, as I remember them, was the level of support that was necessary in order that the school districts, the municipalities, the counties and the townships would have sufficient monies to conduct their business and serve the people of their communities. There were some variable factors, the rate, the effective date, and the amount



that was necessary to be raised. I think it's probably universally accepted that about 500 million dollars is necessary. And it's very difficult to know for sure because after the Supreme Court threw the bombshell to us the corporations did not pay their taxes. The effective date, if you have it effective as of January 1, 1979, you could have a lower rate. If you have it July 1, you could have the higher rate. But there's a very serious question of the ability of this Legislature to enact any ex post facto law and have anything retroactive back to the First of January, 1979. And even if it was Constitutionally possible, you are just encouraging law suits and litigations and during that time our local governments would receive absolutely no money. I participated in conferences with the Governor of this State and with Members of the employer groups, the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association. And we were led to believe that if the rate was reduced under 3% that, although the Bill was not exactly to their liking, that it would be palatable because there had been a reduction from the level of taxation as we passed it out from this House. And it was in response to that that the Senate did put on these Amendments. And now we find the Governor is not supporting it, we find that the Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturing Association is not supporting it. And quite frankly, I don't think they want any replacement. I think that they feel that if there is no replacement whatsoever... they're not going to worry whether or not your children are going to be educated, whether your police and fire are going to render the service that's so necessary, whether your counties are going to be able to perform their services and functions,



they're going to save roughly 500 million dollars and they couldn't care less. We had that same experience with 1331. It was because the employer groups indicated to us that they would accept an Agreed Bill process. I was here when the Agreed Bill process was the order of the day and I can tell you that once that Agreed Bill came in neither Senate nor House, nor Republican nor Democrat, sought to amend it. We accepted it because in effect it was kind of like one of the issues in Collective Bargaining. At the request and the urging of the employer groups, and I may say very reluctantly, ^{the} on / part of the employee groups, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House took our political future in our hands, put it right on the neck and we requested the Governor of this state to activate the Agreed Bill process on both Unemployment Insurance and Workmen's Compensation. At that time there were 6 conferees appointed on both of those subject matters. The conferees agreed that they would be bound and if there was no agreement nothing would be returned. The 6 all signed and the Bill was brought to us and I was never quite so surprised and flabbergasted in my life when I found out the very people that were encouraging us to do it backed away from it and would not support it. I think that the same thing would be true if we tried to do something with Workmen's Compensation. And I'll have to confess that my heart is quite heavy. I have probably as good a business record as any Democrat or incumbent Democrat and I have an acceptable Labor record but I believe people and I take them at their word. And when the Governor of this state indicated in no uncertain terms that what he really wanted was less than 3%, I recommended to the President of the



Senate and the Senate Sponsor that we should accede to that request and put on the Amendments. Now if we hadn't done that this Bill probably would have passed the Senate and you have had the 3% level. I frankly feel that...any suggestion that we should have an...a retroactive tax would be just courting disaster. You're going to starve your local governments and you're not going to get the municipal and the school services that you want. I feel that it's bad faith on the part of the employer groups who back away from this thing at this present time. I don't think we have any alternative. I don't care...you know, personally, I don't represent any government, I don't represent any municipality, any school district. I'm pretty sure/ ^{that} although, the windfall would come to the corporations, if nothing is enacted, that the loss there is going to be reflected in increased real estate taxes on the individual homes back home. And in my district that represents 90 to 92% of the people that live in our area. I think it would be most foolhardy...I think the Legislature, I think this House...and I never have been so proud in my life as I have this Session to be a Member of this Body. I think that they're leading us down the primrose path when they argue. I strongly urge and encourage you with all of the force that is possible within me, to vote green on this and let's get this behind us and go onto other matters. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 'aye', 82 'no'. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, asks for a poll of the absentees."



Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Capuzi. Kucharski. Margulas. Molloy. Schlickman. Stearney. And Von Boeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 86 'ayes', the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Margulas, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Margulas: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. What's the count? On this question there are 87 'ayes', 82 'noes', and the House does not concur on Senate Bills (sic) 3, 13, and 14 on House Bill 2569, and the motion fails. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I would like this put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to put it on Postponed Consideration. Leave is granted. House Bill 706. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom. Mr. McBroom. The Gentleman's not in the Chamber, remove the Bill. House Bill 2567, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2567, which passed this House unanimously, was part of our truth-in-taxation package. The Senate attached Amendment #1, which simply says that in counties with accelerated billing, that the statement that we require under House Bill 2567, would accompany the receipt of the final installment of taxes due. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2567."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Ladies and Gentlemen, we are still in session. Please. Would you give the Gentleman some attention? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, if you'd recognize me for that, I'd move that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You weren't recognized for that. Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Not on this Bill, but when you finish it, will you please recognize me?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. The question is, shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2567. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'ayes', 37 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2567. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1936. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien. Before that, the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an appropriation Bill that came back from the Senate. I would like to recede from two Senate Amendments but I do not know how that will work out. In the event that we cannot recede, we will have to have a Conference Committee. That is why I would like to get this item out of the way, the opportunity for a Conference Committee if it's necessary. I know the hours are getting short, Mr. Speaker, and this may not be the best time to call a Bill but I think it's...we're going to have to do something with it. It's on the Supplemental Calendar, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're going to get to all those matters on the Supplemental Calendar in a very short period of time, Tim. House Bill 1936. The Gentleman from



Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1936. It was a...one Bill of a package of three that the Secretary of State brought in increasing the fees for non-for-profit corporations, also for businesses, corporations to be filed. What they did is they left off an increase fee for filing of documents and issuing of certificates. This Amendment calls for the increase on 1936 from five dollars to ten dollars for the filing of documents and the issuing of certificates on non-for-profit organizations. And I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 13...1936? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Marco. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'ayes', 2 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1936. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 706. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 706 is the Bill that increases funding for counties fairs, 4-H, F.A.A. and so on. The Bill went over to the Senate with a cost of living increase in it. It caused concern to Representative McPike, Representative Ropp and a few others here and the Senate Amendment which I'd like to concur to removes the cost of living escalator. There's also a technical Amendment. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 on House



Bill 706? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'ayes', 0 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 706. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 797, Mr. Rigney. House Bill 797."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker...he has to read it in a third time doesn't he?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No he doesn't, not on concurrence."

Rigney: "Okay, that's right. This Bill, House Bill 797, this is the Bill that allows school districts that have suffered a loss due to a bankruptcy, in excess of one and a half percent of their evaluation, to file an amended state aid claim. The Senate Amendment made it applicable to all bankruptcies, not just bankruptcies of railroads."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 797? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'ayes', 1 'nay', 3 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 797. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 523. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that clarifies the individuals who need to file an affidavit incidental to an adoption. The language was added in the Senate to further clarify precisely those individuals who need to file the affidavit. And I would move for adoption."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Brummer, what...can you elaborate a little more in the exact nature of the Senate changes?"

Brummer: "Yes..."

Johnson: "Tell me what the Bill did originally and what..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The...the..."

Johnson: "Go ahead, I'm sorry."

Brummer: "The Senate added language that said no affidavit needed to be filed by a nonconsenting parent or by any judge or clerk involved in the adoption proceedings. We...the Bill addresses itself to the problem of the requirement of the filing of an affidavit with regard to those involved in the adoption proceeding. The original Bill exempted related adoptions and adult adoptions and addressed itself to the question of those who needed to file the affidavit. The Senate felt that the additional language...to make it specific that a nonconsenting parent or the judge or the clerk involved in the adoption need not file the affidavit."

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

Schneider: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Schneider: "What is the effect of a nonconsenting parent file...not filing an affidavit? What is the pragmatic or practical effect of that...that language?"

Brummer: "You...the nonconsenting parent is not consenting to the adoption in the first place. He may be a putative father, he may be unknown and it is certainly impossible to require a nonconsenting parent to file an affidavit. You serve him with a summons, but you cannot require him to file an affidavit. That is agreed. The Senate wanted to make sure that^{it} was



specific."

Schneider: "But does he not also..."

Brummer: "He...the nonconsenting parent may even be denying parentage so he certainly isn't going to file an affidavit with regard to it."

Schneider: "Is that what happens today? What's current? What's current law with regard to that? Does that prohibit adoption if you have a non...if you know the father and he decides not to want to consent to the adoption, what's the impact in current law?"

Brummer: "Well, the adoption decrees are ^{being} entered. The reason I introduced the legislation is because I have a severe concern that the adoption decrees are voidable."

Schneider: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 523. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco, please vote me 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'ayes', 1 'nay', 3 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 523. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2377, Mr. Griesheimer. Okay."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2377. This Bill left the House for...as it left the House, it was originally a change to the Game Code increasing certain fees with regard to hunting as it applies to commercial hunting and fur bearing trapping to conform with the individual licenses that were raised last year. When it got over to the Senate there were a number of other items they wanted to add to it so they



in effect, they amended the Bill and completely rewrote the Bill. although it still contains all of those provisions with regard to raising the licenses. They added to it the references to the Institute for Natural Resources, established the Department to...or allows the Department to designate wildlife refuges and also established management zones throughout the State of Illinois. It...it is a general overhaul of all of the law applicable to hunting in the State of Illinois as it applies to the commercial elements of hunting. It also established the penalty section for violations of this...of these laws and these licensing laws. Although they generally rewrote it, it is generally and administrative review and update of all of the commercial hunting laws in the State of Illinois. I would urge concurrence with the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question? Mr. Griesheimer..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates..."

Pierce: "...I know in the House we put on a very good Amendment on the Senate Bill in Committee...in the Environmental Committee that took care of the commercial cutting of lumber in the state parks, and I know that was changed in the Senate in some way. But I still think it was kept on in principle, is that right? In the..."

CONTINUED ON PAGE 296



Griesheimer: "No, Representative, I think you have the wrong Bill."

Pierce: "Oh, this is the wrong Bill? Okay."

Griesheimer: "Yeah."

Pierce: "Throw that away."

Griesheimer: "That was 1117...House Bill 1117, and this is House Bill 2377."

Pierce: "Oh, I'm sorry. I'll ask the Bill (sic) when we come to that one."

Griesheimer: "The other Bill has already gone to Conference Committee, and I believe the Committee has agreed upon wording to establish that. It's not this Bill."

Pierce: "All right. They've kept that provision in there. All right. I'm sorry."

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

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "Ron, does this have the provisions about entering property and...without a search warrant and so forth that we had in the Fish Code? The other Department Bill?"

Griesheimer: "I don't believe it does. I believe that is in the other Bill. As I understood it, the other Bill was amended with the terms of that Bill. I do not believe it was actually placed in this Bill."

Getty: "It's rather an important subject matter. I'd really like to know that we weren't creating a monster here."

Griesheimer: "Well, according to the analysis which I have of the Senate Amendment, this does not cover that particular phase of the subject. I believe what happened is that House Bill 1990 met a defeat in the Senate, and they added it on, and I believe it was added onto House Bill 2378 by Amendment in the Senate. I don't think it was put on House Bill 2377. There appears to be no reference to any rights with regard



to this in this particular Bill which is applicable only to hunting."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2377. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Hey, Marco. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', 5 'nays', none recorded as 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2377. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2378. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2378 is the same type of Bill as the prior Bill, although it applies to aquatic life or fish life. It updates the commercial fishing licenses which were raised for individuals in the last term of the Legislature. This updates all of them for commercial purposes which includes not only fishing but dip net type of fishing, bull frogging and mussel fishing in the Mississippi and Wabash. I believe to that extent it follows essentially the Bill that came out of the House. This was also amended just as the prior Bill. I believe that Representative Getty's question refers to Senate Amendment #2. Senate Amendment #2 amended into this Bill the terms of House Bill 1990. According to the information...Senate Bill #2...Senate Bill #... excuse me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Griesheimer. Let's give the Gentleman some attention, please. Will the House please come to order?"

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #2 took these terms and it...it authorized certain employees of the department to investigate and inspect lands and waters under the jurisdiction of the department."



It is my understanding that it follows the format that has been followed before which allows them to enter these public lands for purposes of ^{these} inspections. To my knowledge they followed the wording of the House but I cannot say at this point in time, in direct answer to Representative Getty's question, whether it's exactly the same. I was supposed to have two people here from the department to answer that and, as so often happens, they are gone."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2378? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, in deference to the question asked by your staff and Mr. Getty, I know we're in the middle of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He'll get the answer. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'ayes', 5 'noes', 2 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2378. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1970. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1970. Let me indicate to you that House Bill 1970, as originally went out, allowed counties to have a option of having a twelve member Board of Health. That option was put in because of some federal monies that could be made available to counties and counties health departments if it would follow the federal requirements of having a twelve member board. That went out of here by a very big vote. What the Senate did



Amendment #1 was to add an Amendment which created the Retail Food Establishment Sanitation Act and it was identical to some other legislation which we had here in the past in the...in the House. And if there are any questions on it, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that those be addressed to Mr. Kempiners who is much more familiar with the details of the legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question if I could. Is this not a Bill that we defeated earlier this week or last week that would give inspections to a county health department downstate and it would cause them to inspect these little food establishments?"

Peters: "Yes, Sir, it is."

Dunn: "Then, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think I'll look closely at this Bill. This Amendment was one that was defeated earlier. And it would create a lot of havoc in our downstate with our little restaurants and the people that do business in the little towns are going to have...inspection by the Department of Public Health, the state inspectors, and it's something I don't think they want. I think that it's something that we need to look into. I'd like you to tell us a little more if you will, Representative Peters. Tell me a little bit more about this Bill. Refresh our memory, if you will, Mr. Sponsor."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yeah. You want me to describe what...what this is all about?"

Dunn: "Yeah, what the Amendment is. I've forgotten what the Bill really does."



Kempiners: "Okay. The Amendment is designed to provide uniformity in the requirement for food inspection... inspection of retail food services in the State of Illinois. It basically provides that the state, in meetings with the local health departments over a two year period, will establish regulations and ^{that} /they will then have the ability to engage in a contractual relationship with the local enforcement agency, whether it be the county or the municipality health department or just that unit of government itself. There will be one fee charged, which it's fifty dollars in the statute, ^{of} /which eighty percent will go to the local enforcing agency and twenty percent to the state. There is an advisory board that is created that consists of three members who are public health officers, three members who are restaurant owners and three members who are representatives of trade associations. The fifty dollar fee...there's a threshold of one hundred and fifty thousand gross... a hundred and fifty thousand dollars gross business per year before the fifty dollar fee is applicable. But it is an attempt to eliminate the duplication of fees that these restaurants pay and to have uniformity in the requirements that they have to meet throughout the state."

Dunn: "Is this statewide? Does it include the City of Chicago?"

Kempiners: "It...it can include the City of Chicago if they enter into a contractual agreement with the State Department of Public Health."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to oppose the Bill and ask that we vote 'no' on the concurrence and that a Conference Committee be appointed. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"



Speaker Flinn: "One moment. For what purpose does Representative Brummer rise?"

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm looking at the Amendment and I see it...it creates an entirely new Act. It's a new Act on a House Bill that had nothing to do with that Act. And I would ask for a ruling from the Chair concerning the germaneness of this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Will the Parliamentarian come to the Podium, please? Let's take that out of the record if the Sponsor don't object. Representative Peters, we'll take that out of the record temporarily until the Parliamentarian can take a look at it. On nonconcurrency Calendar, page 9, appears Senate Bill 533. Representative Ropp for a motion. 533."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 533 has to do with the State Fair Commission and the Amendment was put on here in the House. I have talked to the House Sponsor and he in turn has agreed to receding on this Amendment. And I move to recede on Senate Bill 533."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House recede on Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 533. Any discussion? If not, all those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed say 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 voting 'aye' and 1 voting 'nay'. And the House does recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 533. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Supplemental Calendar we have indications from various Sponsors that they intend to refuse to recede and we're...we want to call these in order that we can get the Conference Committees lined up, ready for tomorrow. The first one will be Senate Bill 484, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move not to



recede on Amendments 2, 4 and 8 on 484."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has refused...made a motion to refuse to recede from House Bill #2...Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 484. And on the question, Representative Cullerton. 2, 4 and 8 are the Amendment numbers so we get this right."

Cullerton: "I justed wanted the Gentleman to explain what the Amendments are."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Amendment 2 was put on in the Committee by McClain to fund the...conservation districts. Amendment 4 is the Amendment which will help see to it that this young man, like this fine young man we had that stood before us today in FFA, will receive a little more in premium money for showing his cattle and the 4-H members will...can win up to ten and a half per member instead of five dollars and fifty cents. And they haven't had an increase in over ten years. It will add a little more money to help keep some of the county fairs rehabilitated so that they can have a place to train their horses or what have you. And Amendment #8 will help fund, at the local level, and the part time help to implement House Bill 818 or Public Law 208, which is covered by the soil and water conservation districts. And the employees will be either hired by the soil and water conservation districts locally, and there will be no hiring on this from Springfield, and...or they will probably take, in some instances, the part-time employees and put them on full-time. And the state required that they oversee this and develop plans to do it and this is the first time they have provided any funds."

Cullerton: "Amendment #7. Did you explain Amendment #7."

Robbins: "Amendment #8."

Cullerton: "What about Amendment #7?"



Robbins: "Amendment #7, if it's there is already concurred."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the Gentleman has...Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I'm not sure if I understand the procedure here. As I understand it, there were a number of Amendments added and the Sponsor is moving to recede with regard to two of them..."

Robbins: "To not recede. I want to keep my Amendments on."

Speaker Flinn: "Maybe I can straighten something out here. The Gentleman is moving to refuse to recede from these Amendments and not take them off. There's a little misunderstanding as what we're talking about. So we're not taking Amendments off but demanding that they stay on that was put on by the House, and he's requesting Conference Committees. Does that straighten everybody out? Okay. The Gentleman has moved that ...made a motion to refuse to recede from House Amendments 2, 4 and 8 on Senate Bill 484. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. And the Conference Committee will be appointed. On the same Calendar we have Senate Bill 581. Representative Simms, is he here? Here he is. Representative Simms is recognized for a motion when he gets to his desk on 581."

Simms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House do not concur and..."

Speaker Flinn: "Not recede you mean."

Simms: "Excuse me."

Speaker Flinn: "To recede, rather."

Simms: "I move that the House..."

Speaker Flinn: "Refuse to recede."

Simms: "...do not recede in Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 and request a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, the Gentleman has moved that the House



refuse to recede on Senate Amend...House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 on Senate Bill 581. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from these Amendments and a Conference Committee will be appointed. The next one I have is Representative Getty's. We need to make the morion to refuse to recede, Representative Getty. On Senate Bill 622."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 622..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 on..."

Getty: "...and a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "...Senate Bill 622. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede and a Conference Committee will be appointed. The next one is Representative Bowman. Is he within ear shot on the floor? Representative Bowman, we'll pass him. Representative Reilly. Jim Reilly. Representative Kucharski, is he here? Representative Getty with another one. 1320. Representative Mike Getty is recognized for a motion."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House refuse to recede from the House Amendment to 1320 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 1320. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1320 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. On page 2 under Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 157 and Representative Barnes has requested



leave of the House to move this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted and the Bill is on Second Reading. The Bill has been read a second time. We're waiting on the Amendments to come up and we'll have them in a minute. Okay. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 36, Yourell-Reilly, amends Senate Bill 157 by inserting immediately after Section 16 the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell on the floor? Representative Reilly. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #36 is an ordinary contingency expense for the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. It is thirty-one thousand, one hundred and seventy. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #36."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #36 to Senate Bill 157. Any discussion? If not, all those in favor say 'aye', those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment #36 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 37, Pierce, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended on page 1 by inserting immediately after Section 2.02 the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "On the instructions of the Leader of my caucus, Representative Barnes, I will withdraw this Amendment and hope for the best."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #37. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 38, Taylor, amends Senate Bill 157..."

Pierce: "God bless Mayor Byrnes."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Taylor."



Taylor: "Amendment #38 appropriates one hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the purposes of the Auditor General to be able to make independent investigations of the Cook County Hospital. I move for the adoption of Amendment #38."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #38. Discussion? Representative Vinson is recognized."

Vinson: "I wonder if the Gentleman might repeat what the Amendment does."

Speaker Flinn: "Will you repeat what the Amendment does, Representative Taylor?"

Taylor: "It appropriates one hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the audit of the Cook County Hospital."

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

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

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "The normal procedure for asking for an audit is to introduce a Resolution, which is the way we direct the Auditor General or the Audit Commission to do an audit. Has that Resolution been introduced?"

Taylor: "No, we have not introduced a Resolution. But I think because of the nature of this audit it will have to be of a private agency and therefore we're going to need outside...independent auditing firm."

Totten: "Well, may I suggest that you...the money alone is not enough. In order implement it you have to introduce a Resolution...right away to do and we could support you on that."

Taylor: "Representative Totten, the Resolution is forthcoming."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, I just want to ask if this is to have the Auditor General do this audit? It's not within the



purview of his regular..."

Taylor: "No, that's...the Auditor General will audit the Department of Public Aid and the subcontractor will be able to audit the County Hospital."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative..."

Friedrich: "Well, all I can say is that I don't think at the present time he has the authority to do it unless we give him that authority."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is my understanding that under the statutes, the Auditor General is allowed to audit state agencies or departments of state agencies but has the authority to investigate any other agencies that the Legislature may give them the authority to do. So you are right, Representative Friedrich, there is a split here. He has the right to audit the Illinois Department of Public Aid but only the right to investigate the ...Cook County Hospital situation. And this is part of what we would hope to be some resolution of the county hospital problem in its appropriation. To go through the process at Public Aid to see what they're doing right and what they're doing wrong and the same Friedrich:

at the county." "I'm in favoring of doing this, the only thing that I want to be sure is that we get it in the record that we give the Auditor General the proper authority and so. He is neither for or against this, I've talked to him about it. I just want to make sure that we, in doing this, that it's done properly."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the... Representative Taylor to close."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I will have forthcoming two Resolutions tomorrow in order to give the Auditor General the proper tools in order to work



with. So I move for the adoption of Amendment #2,
Sir, to..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has..."

Taylor: "...Senate Bill 157."

Speaker Flinn: "...moved for the adoption of Amendment #38
to Senate Bill 157. All those in favor say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the
Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 39, Younge, amends Senate Bill 157
as amended by inserting immediately after Section 1.05
the following."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative
Younge."

Younge: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to table that Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #39. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 40, Hanahan, amends Senate Bill 157
as amended by inserting immediately after Section 2.03
the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Is Representative Hanahan on the floor?
Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 41, Peters, amends Senate Bill 157
as amended by inserting immediately after Section
14.06 the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to withdraw Amendments
41, 42 and 43."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendments 41, 42
and 43. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 44, Peters, amends Senate Bill 157
as amended by inserting immediately after Section
14.03 the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, through an oversight one place or
another, what we did forget is the appropriation for



the Fellowship and Intern Programs. And this would... this Amendment would appropriate funds for that in the amount of one hundred and nine thousand dollars."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #44 to Senate Bill 157. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 45, Peters, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 14.04 the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters. Peters. Turn Peters on."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, regardless of the outcome of what, we do need the ...we need to implement whatever personal property tax legislation is passed. And Amendment 45 to Senate Bill 157 would appropriate a total sum of five million, two hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars for the Department of Revenue for expenses relative to the implementation of the replacement tax of personal...the personal property tax."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion?"

Peters: "I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #45 to Senate Bill 157. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #45 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 46, Peters, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 14.06 the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment 46 is an appropriation in the sum of one hundred thousand dollars. And what we did, the House



and Senate has passed a sunset legislation and this... one hundred thousand dollars would be to fund the Joint Committee on the Regulatory Review for fiscal 1980. This is to implement the sunset legislation we passed. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #46. Any discussion? If not, all those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #46 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment 47, E.M. Barnes-Matijevich, amends Senate Bill 157 as amended by inserting immediately after Section 10 the following."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll just read off this list so you will know everything that's here but this is, in essence, House Bill 2004. Chain of Lakes for thirty thousand; Joint Committee on Income Tax, ten thousand; Atomic Energy, sixty-one thousand, four hundred; Mines problems, ten thousand; Insurance Study Commission, eighty-three thousand, ninety dollars; Data Information System, ninety-two thousand, six eighty; Study... Cities and Villeges, sixty-nine thousand; Joint Committee on Administrative Rules, fifty six...five hundred and sixty^{-six}/thousand, eight hundred and thirty; County Problems, one hundred and fifteen thousand, eight eighty; Water Resources, sixty-six thousand, five hundred; Labor Management, ten thousand; Election Laws, fifteen thousand; Advisory to RTA, five thousand; Law Revision, thirty-five thousand; Midway Airport, fifty thousand; Spanish Speaking, fifty thousand; Task Force on Teachers of Illinois, one hundred and sixteen thousand, two fifty-four; Commission on Children, to one hundred and ninety-three thousand, five fifty-three;



Status of Women, seventy-five thousand one; Rewrite Public Aid, two fifty-one, eight seventy-five; School Problems, seventy-one, four hundred and five; Health and Fitness, forty thousand; Violent Crime Study, fifty thousand; Economic Prosperity, sixty thousand; Commission on Mental Health, one hundred and twenty-seven thousand, five and seventy; Labor Laws, thirty-two thousand, five ; Energy Resources, one fifty-eight, three eight-two; DLGA, two hundred and fifty thousand; DLGA Wabash Region, forty thousand; Public Library Study, fifty thousand; Model School for Deaf, ten thousand; Year of the Child, fourteen thousand; Ethnic Study, thirty-five thousand; INR, one hundred thousand; Displaced Homemakers, three hundred thousand; Supreme Court, twenty-five thousand; Criminal Sentence Commission, one hundred and thirty-seven thousand, nine hundred and twenty; Criminal Sentence Corrections, a hundred and thirty-nine thousand, nine hundred and twenty; EPA Study, one hundred and fifty-six thousand, five hundred; Public Museum, two million. All total, Amendment #47 is five million, seven hundred and three thousand, three hundred and fifty-nine. This has embodied the essence of House Bill 2004 which went to the Senate. I would move for adoption of Amendment #47."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #47. And on that motion, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor has said that what he has done is put everything that was in...I think everything, I don't know what he could have left out. He probably added some that was in 2004 into this measure. This Amendment is for five million, seven hundred and three thousand dollars. It includes the Year of the Child,



it includes the Model School for the Deaf, a Commission that's never met. It includes almost all other... a large number of the other Commissions. I think there's some thirty different items of the Amendment that the Gentleman from Cook has proposed. One for a hundred and thirty-seven thousand dollars for the Criminal Sentencing Commission which was a Bill we defeated, which was defeated in the Senate the other day. This is the real catch-all Amendment. And ^{with} these controversial items in there, there is five million reasons for voting 'no' against this. And the main reason is it's five million dollars. And I ought to think... I think that at this late hour we ought to find a way to keep from putting these Christmas trees together. We ought to take the Membership decide to beat some of these things. We ought to leave them beat. This is not the way to resurrect them and I would suggest a 'no' vote and I want a Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment thwarts the will of this House. It includes many appropriations this House has beaten time and time again. One of the Amendments included in this particular omnibus Amendment is fourteen thousand dollars for International Year of the Child. We beat an appropriation for that activity in December. We beat an appropriation for that activity last month. And last month when we beat it, we had over ninety votes against the Amendment. I think we ought to duplicate that effort now and defeat this Amendment. We do not need this appropriation. We do not need a lot of the rest of the five million dollars in this Amendment. Defeat this Amendment. Let them come in with a stripped down Amendment with the really worthwhile things left in and take out things



like International Year of the Child. When the Governor made the appointment to the Task Force on the International Year of the Child, he made a promise that there would be no money involved. That it would be only a task force appointment these would not be any state funds to be expended. And ever since then we've had to battle him to...make him keep his promise. I urge you to help him keep his promise, again this evening, defeat International Year of the Child/^{for}the third time. Vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will. Representative Barnes, you're being questioned."

Brummer: "I see Section 10.39 appropriates two million dollars to the Institute of Natural Resources for the funding of public museums as provided by law. I'm not acquainted with that program. I'm a little concerned when it suddenly pops up in a...deep in an Amendment for two million dollars. Could you explain it?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I'm very sorry. Representative, would you repeat that please?"

Brummer: "Yeah, Section 10.39 appropriates two million dollars to the Institute of Natural Resources for funding of public museums. That's not very descriptive. I suppose it's adequate, but it's not adequate for me. I don't know where those public museums are or who they are or why they're in this Amendment."

Barnes: "The law provides for funding for all of the museums ...the public museums in the State of Illinois. We appropriate this money and then it is then allocated on a pro...prorata share to each of the appropriate



museums that fall within the constraints of the already existing law."

Brummer: "Is this a total appropriation for public museums in the State of Illinois, two million dollars?"

Barnes: "No, this is merely a subsidy that is...is being added here for the purpose of distribution to all of the public museums."

Brummer: "Well, why wasn't that added in in the Institute of Natural Resources Bill in the first place...the appropriation Bill?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like an answer to my..."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, I'm sorry. I thought you were finished. Representative Brummer. Turn him back on. They're looking up the answer right now."

Barnes: "As I understand the problem, Dick, is that only a million dollars was embodied in that Bill. It should have been three million dollars and we are putting in the additional two million dollars here. The General Assembly has historically appropriated three million dollars ^{for} disbursements for this purpose. ^{that} And in the Bill/you refer to, only one million dollars was in it."

Brummer: "My Majority Leader has just explained it to me, a lot clearer than you have. With regard to 10.35, it appropriates three hundred thousand dollars for the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development for the Displaced Homemakers Program. Once again, I don't understand why in the appropriations process, with the lengthy debated Appropriations Committee and the many hours that they toll and the staff works, why that three hundred thousand dollars wasn't included in the GOMHD Appropriation Bill?"

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Brummer, let me explain one thing to you and I hope everyone is listening to this, Mr. Speaker.



These appropriations that are embodied in this Amendment have been acted on by the Senate. There were some that were deleted. We are merely trying to put into one piece of legislation here the..those appropriations that have been both acted on by the House and by the Senate. That's all we're doing here. These appropriations have passed both Houses. And all we're doing is putting them, consolidating them, into one Bill."

Brummer: "But that doesn't answer the question of why the three hundred thousand dollars for the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development, which is a multi-million dollar budget, didn't contain the three hundred thousand dollars that is stuck deep on page eight on this forty-seventh Amendment to this Bill."

Barnes: "Well, Representative Brummer, as I indicated to you, this Bill...this came back from the Senate in this condition. I was not at the Senate hearings. I could not tell you the complete justification for that..."

Brummer: "Well, wait a minute. We're considering a House Amendment right now."

Barnes: "But this was a House Bill that went over to the Senate, if you listen very carefully. This was a House Bill that went to the Senate. These are those appropriations that were passed by the Senate. We are merely incorporating them into one Bill. All of the appropriations that went to the Senate is not here because the Senate took them out."

Brummer: "Well, this is a Senate Bill...if I can read the board correctly, it's Senate Bill 157. It's on Second Reading in the House, we're adding House Amendments."

Barnes: "Mr. Brummer, this is Senate Bill 157. In Amendment 47...the essence of Amendment 47 is House Bill 2004,



which was enacted on by the Senate. There were deletions from that Bill. What we are doing in House...in Senate Bill 147...157 with Amendment 47 is incorporating both the House and the Senate into one Bill. We do it every Session. It is not unusual. And this is all that we are attempting to do here. Everything that I listed here has either or been acted on by the House and the Senate that we are trying now to incorporate into one Bill. That's all we are doing."

Brummer: "Wonderful. But I still don't understand why the three hundred thousand dollars wasn't in the GOMHD Appropriation Bill."

Barnes: "Again, Mr. Brummer, that's something that you would have to ask the Sponsor of that, I'm not even sure who that is, and you would have to ask the Senate why they approved it."

Brummer: "Well, you're...you're the Sponsor of this Amendment. that's why..."

Barnes: "I'm the Sponsor of the Amendment, within that Amendment is the three hundred thousand dollars that was acted on by the House and the Senate and was approved."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson. I'll get to you, Mrs. Macdonald, when your turn comes."

Johnson: "Representative Barnes, were you here on the floor ...it may be in the same day, I guess it in successive days, when the House resoundingly defeated the hundred and thirty-seven...hundred and thirty-nine appropriation for the Criminal Sentencing Commission?"

Barnes: "No."

Johnson: "Well, if I were to tell you that both of those attempts were defeated about 4 to 1 after full debate, could you tell me why we should appropriate



this now on this Amendment for that particular entity?"

Barnes: "Representative, again let me explain to you, all I'm doing with this Amendment is incorporating into one Bill those lines that I read for those purposes that the Senate had acted upon. Now I didn't get into the deliberations in the Senate. I can't tell you why they approved these, but they did. Now you're saying that they wasn't approved in the House? I don't know that's...that's a fact. I accept your explanation but all I'm doing with Amendment 47 is ...is putting together into one piece of legislation those items that have been approved by the House and or by the Senate. That's all I am doing."

Johnson: "But let me...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I really can't...can't and don't blame the Sponsor because I suppose tradition has grown up around this idiotic way of doing things. But we're in a position here, kind of a Catch 22. I favor many of the particular items that are contained within this Amendment. But I also think we're flying directly in the face of the will of this Legislature, as Representative Pullen has indicated before in the International Year of the Child, and most particularly, when we come to the Criminal Sentencing Commission. I wish Representative Stearney were here because he could express it far better than I. But the debate on that was very full. And Representative Stearney, if I quoted him right, said we really don't need a Criminal Sentencing Commission anymore, we don't need it expanded anymore because we've already made everything Class X or aggravated battery. And the House responded with an overwhelming vote to delete the funds for the Criminal Sentencing Commission. And so we're really in a position of...of voting 'yes' or 'no'



and being wrong in either case. I resent that kind of a technique. And for that reason, I'm going to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. And the question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "I would move for the adoption of Amendment 47."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #47 to House...Senate Bill 15...House... Representative Johnson, you've already spoken."

Johnson: "No, I just want to make a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Johnson: "My point is, there's a lot of people on both sides of the aisle, and this is not a partisan issue, who are aren't here. I would simply make the simple request that people vote their own switches so we can see whether people are really for this way of running government."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #47 to Senate Bill 157. 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 77 'ayes', 51 'nays' and the Amendment is adopted. House Bill 2577, Representative Polk...concurrence. I'm sorry. Is there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. House Bill 2577. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, on Senate 891 and



Senate Bill 157, I would move that the proper rule would be suspended so these Bills...these two Bills can be heard on Third Reading tonight...for immediate consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I move to divide."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Barnes, the Gentleman has the right to divide the question so..."

Matijevich: "I'll go along...I'll go along with 157 but it will take 107 on the DOT Bill and I haven't seen any agreement I like yet. Oh, yeah, I like McClain's a little better than anybody elses."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I would withdraw that motion."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is withdrawn. Representative Polk on 2577. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is on House Bill 2577. We move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment 1, 4, 5 and 6. I move that we establish a Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we...that the House do not concur...just until I finish the motion, I'll get with you. The Gentleman has moved that we do not concur with Senate Amendments #1, 4, 5 and 6 on House Bill 2577. And on that motion, Representative Vinson is recognized."

Vinson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Do any of these Senate Amendments relate to the leasing division of the department?"

Polk: "No."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten."



Totten: "Mr. Speaker, what agent...will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

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

Totten: "What agency is this?"

Polk: "The Department of Labor."

Totten: "Is there any RTA funding in this?"

Polk: "No."

Totten: "Okay. Will there be any when it comes out of Conference Committee?"

Polk: "No."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Barnes, you've got your light on, do you wish to speak on this?"

Barnes: "Right after this."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Any further discussion? Representative Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Is this a motion to nonconcur?"

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is to nonconcur on these Amendments. The Gentleman has moved...the Gentleman has moved that we...that the do not concur in Senate Amendments #1, 4, 5 and 6 on House Bill 2577. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does not concur. On nonconcurrency...Representative Barnes, I'm sorry. You wanted to be recognized? Representative Polk."

Polk: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you can't do that until the Senate recedes and then we'll do it."

Polk: "Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "It's not the appropriate time. Representative Barnes. Turn Barnes on."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would then move, Mr. Speaker, that we suspend the appropriate rule so that House Bill 157 and 15...Senate Bill 157, Senate Bill 891...would suspend the proper rule to



suspend the deadline so these two Bills could be heard tomorrow."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we suspend Rule 35 G so that these two Bills can be heard tomorrow on Third Reading. All in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "What is Senate Bill 891."

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear you. It's a DOT appropriation. Motion is to suspend Rule 35 G so that these Bills can be heard on Third Reading tomorrow. Representative Grossi. Grossi."

Grossi: "Grossi."

Speaker Flinn: "Grossi, Grossi."

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you tell me how many votes this will take."

Speaker Flinn: "89? 89 votes. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I just want to make sure I'm reading into the record the rule that he is suspending because I surely don't want these, not this Bill so much but the other Bill, heard tonight. And I want to be... make sure I read it into the record because he only said to suspend the appropriate rule...that he is suspending Rule 35 G, is it? 35 G, then that's the deadline rule so that this Bill...these Bills can be heard tomorrow. Is that...all right. I go along with that."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 voting 'aye' and 12 voting 'no'. And the motion is adopted, the rule is suspended for these two Bills. Under nonconcurrency...I'm going to try to go through that again to get as much done here as we can. Senate Bill 289, Representative Getty. Representative Mike Getty. 289 on the non-concurrency. Take it out of the record. Stuffle, I



don't see him here. Representative Peters, on 769 on nonconcurrency. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask guidance of the Chair. 769 has been taken care of with a supplemental appropriation for FY 79. I would make whatever appropriate motion the Chair would suggest to just get it off the Calendar. We're not going to call it. We...what happened is we have two Bills going in both ways and we settled with the other Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we'll just leave it on the Calendar and it'll die."

Peters: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten on Senate Bill 1053. Nonconcurrency list, 1053."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to recede from House Amendment #1 because it's similar to an Amendment that we adopted before."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, what's the Gentleman's motion?"

Speaker Flinn: "He moved to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1053. It's on page 10."

Madigan: "I move a substitute motion that we refuse to recede."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman...let me state the motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, has moved a substitute motion that we refuse to recede. Representative Totten, on the motion."

Totten: "Would you please take the Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Flinn: "Take the Bill out of the record. We're running out of Sponsors of what I've got on the Calendar that I can see. Is there anybody that's got anything they would like...Representative Vinson. Oh gee, look at them all stand up. Representative Vinson, do you have something. Tell me the page of



the Calendar and what you wish to do."

Vinson: "Page 6, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2134. I move for concurrence."

Speaker Flinn: "Which one? What's the number of the Bill?"

Vinson: "2134."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Any further discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Probably an extreme request, but did the Sponsor say what the Senate Amendment does?"

Vinson: "I couldn't hear the question, Mr. Brummer."

Speaker Flinn: "Explain the Amendment, what it does."

Vinson: "The Bill is the Civil Service Reform Bill that we passed overwhelmingly some...about a month ago. What the Senate Amendment does is reduce^{its} application to...from approximately a thousand people to eight hundred people. And to make clear, that it does not apply to anybody who is on a negotiated rate or a prevailing rate."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further..."

Vinson: "...., Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "What did he say, from a thousand to eight hundred?"

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

Giorgi: "Did you say a thousand to eight hundred?"

Vinson: "Yes, it reduces the number, that's right."

Giorgi: "Okay, thanks."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative O'Brien's light is on. Somebody turn him off. Okay. Any further discussion? If not, the Gentleman has moved that we concur in Amendment #1 to Senate Bill...House Bill 2134. 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 129 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no'. And the House does concur in Amendment #1 to



House Bill 2134. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. There are so many people asking why don't we just... I'll pick on Representative Reilly and then Ewing and all of those... O'Brien is another one and Matijevich. Now in the meantime, if you want to stay a little later, come down and put your names on a list. I've called some of you people and you weren't on the floor... earlier. I don't know whether it's the same situation. Start with Reilly. What... what's yours? Name that..."

Reilly: "On Supplemental Calendar, Senate Bill 1072. I would move that the House refuse to recede and ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede in what... in Amendments #1 and 2 on the Supplemental Calendar and that a Conference Committee be appointed. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. 1072. I said 1072. Supplemental Calendar, Senate Bill 1072. We had it all marked up here for refusals so that we could get... Joe McGah busy on picking them. That's one of those. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House recedes... refuses to recede on the... and the Conference Committee will be appointed. All right, I'm going to go to O'Brien and Ewing. O'Brien, where's yours at?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 933, with Senate Amendment #1. And I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and defer to Representative Kempiners for the explanation on the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear the Bill number, there was too much noise going on."

O'Brien: "I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, it's House Bill 933. And I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and defer to



Senator...Representative Kempiners for an explanation on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 933."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to concur with Senate Amendment...turn it to concur. The Gentleman has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 933. And Representative...who did you want to defer to? Kempiners. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I think you're getting as bad as I am, Mr. Speaker. My Seatmate says I ought to refuse to explain it but it's really a very simple Amendment. And it basically relates to forest preserve districts that...there's a provision in the law right now that ...with regards to the selling of revenue bonds and it limits the sale of revenue bonds to counties over one hundred thousand. And this would reduce that one hundred thousand limit down to twenty-five thousand. And then I would move it's adoption...or I would move that we concur."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we concur in Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 933...House Bill 933, I'm sorry. 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 98 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'nay'. And the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 933. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Ewing now. Give me the page number."

Ewing: "Yes. I hope everybody is awake now. Page 8, House Bill 2642."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. State your motion. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. This Bill amends the Illinois Tax Act, expands and clarifies provisions relating to levy upon property of delinquent taxpayers. Senate Amendment 1, this is a technical Amendment. It



changes the word 'has' to 'has been' relating to issuance of warrants."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2642. All those 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 143 voting 'aye' and 0 voting 'nay'. The House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2642. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 793, Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 793, Senate Amendment #1 excludes from ^{the} definition of printing, any printed matter used in a normal day-to-day operation of the General Assembly...the Senate thought that that should be put on there. I don't...I'm sure it wasn't needed but it's a further protection that...that is not included. And I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 793."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 793. 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 130 'ayes', 0 'nays'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 793. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Let me back up, John, and pick up...and pick up McMaster because I did overlook him an hour and a half ago. House Bill 487. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the regular appropriation for the Department of Local Government Affairs. Two Amendments...Senate Bill...Senate Bill, Sir."



Speaker Flinn: "I'm sorry, I said House Bill. It is Senate Bill, sorry."

McMaster: "Well I'll go ahead while the Clerk is getting... there, there we are. This is the regular appropriation for the Department of Local Government Affairs. Two Amendments put on in the House, House Amendment #4 for forty-two thousand from the General Revenue Fund for planning grants to the Greater Egypt Regional Planning and Development Commission. And House Amendment #5, fifty thousand from GRF for ^agrant to Argonne National Laboratories for a digital allis...pilot program to assist in the computation of land values and productivity. These ^{two} Amendments were put on in the House. The Senate, under their urging, refused to accept these Amendments...would not concur them. For that reason, I will have to move to recede from these two Amendments. And I think we will probably have to have a Roll Call vote..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to recede from House Amendments #4 and 5 on Senate Bill 487. All those in favor vote 'aye'...who wishes the floor? Oh, that...Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, both of these Amendments were Committee Amendments, one in behalf of Representative LeRoy Van Dyne and one in behalf of Wyvetter Younge. And I think to respect the Committee system. They were placed on there...I'm not sure if they were unanimous, I forgot, but I know there was a good vote on these Amendments. And, therefore, I would ask this House that we refuse to recede to those two... a substitute motion that we refuse to recede on those two Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "You made a...Representative Matijeich made a substitute motion that we refuse to recede."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "I will have a chance to close, will I not, if they're through?"

Speaker Flinn: "I'll recognize you in a minute. I'm just going to state the motion. That is the motion, that Representative Matijevich moves that we refuse to recede from House Amendments #4 and 5, Senate Bill 487. On the...on that motion, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to oppose, of course, the motion to not recede. These are not too large amounts of money. But let me explain the forty-two thousand from GRF for the Greater Egypt Regional Planning and Development Commission. I happen to have a lot on a lake at home. I might put in an Amendment on some Bill to^{have} you, the people of the State of Illinois, fund a regional planning Commission for that lake. I think we can go to any county that has a planning Commission and ask for the same thing. I don't object to the amount. But I think that we would be starting a precedent whereby we might be encouraged in the General Assembly to fund everything in the way of any planning Commission within the State of Illinois. I don't wish to really object so much to the amount, I guess, it's just the idea of what we would be putting ourselves into in the future in this General Assembly by way of a precedent. That is Amendment #4, the forty-two thousand. House Amendment #5, which adds fifty thousand to GRF for the grants for the Argonne National Laboratory for a digital allis pilot program, which was my understanding, is some type of a computer program which would be possibly not...known really to me, a value to people in figuring land values^{and}/productivity under our new prime land evaluation law. Whether it's necessary or



not, I can't really say. But, nevertheless, it is an Amendment of Representative Van Dwyne. If he wishes to speak to it, he's perfectly welcome to. But I am objecting to this motion to not recede and I would urge, for that reason, a 'no' vote on the motion to not recede."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know much about the Argonne National Laboratory but I know a little bit about the Greater Egypt Planning Commission. And I don't think there's any reason we can't do without it all right."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House do not recede...refuse to recede from Amendments 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 487. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 79 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'nay'. And, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to put this into a verification or anything like that. I'm not going to call for a...poll of the absentees or anything. Really, I think there's a little bit...unfortunate that we have people voting other peoples switches down here. I would hope you might want to dump this one and take a Roll Call without everyone's switch being punched. I think it's time to ^{be} fair. I've tried to be fair with everyone down here in regards to...and I would urge you to dump this and see if the rest of them can be as fair as I'm trying to be."

Speaker Flinn: "Well in order to get along with the same... where it seems like we're doing pretty good. Let's dump the Roll Call and take another one. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Vote



your own switches. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 'ayes', 66 'noes'."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would urge then that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. The House does refuse to recede from Senate...from House Amendments #4 and 5 to Senate Amendment...Senate Bill 487 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Representative Matijevich on House Bill 859. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 859, Senate Amendment #3 limits the impact of the Bill to only cover those drainage districts drainage districts that having the county collector...the drainage assessments levied by the district and all such districts would be required to provide the county clerk with the legal description of the boundaries of such districts and the provide the clerk a new legal description within sixty days of any boundary change. And I move to concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 859."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman...I'm sorry, I was distracted. Your motion is to..."

Matijevich: "To concur."

Speaker Flinn: "Motion is to concur to Amendment #3 to House Bill 859. 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 question there are 125 voting 'aye' and 2 voting 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 859. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2411. Representative Matijevich for a motion."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have one more after this. But to House Bill 2411, Senate Amendment #1 provides



for professional technical artistic services involving expenditures exceeding fifty thousand to be subject to competitive bidding...the requirements of the Illinois Purchasing Act. And I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2411."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2411. And on that, Representative Hallstrom. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On page 10, Senate Bill 1386..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, wait a minute. We're on another here first."

Hallstrom: "Oh..."

Speaker Flinn: "I saw your light on. I thought you wanted to speak on it. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, John, I'm not rising in opposition, I just want to clarify. We had one or two Bills early in the Session in the House Judiciary I Committee dealing with this subject. And as I recall, we had quite extensive testimony on the...on the subject matter. And I just wondered if you could kind of tell us how this coordinates or doesn't coordinate with those particular pieces of legislation."

Matijevich: "I'm not as familiar with that legislation, not being a Member of the Judiciary Committee. However, on the Bill and the Senate Committee I was in the Senate Committee/was fairly adamant about the fact that they should go through competitive bidding on these contracts over fifty thousand dollars. And the Auditor General thought that I ought to accept this Amendment at the time of that Committee hearing."

Johnson: "Well, my...I guess the point that was raised in the testimony in the Committee, and in fact this is one of the issues that you don't expect to, but that you do receive some communications on, was that the nature of the services here are such that they're...it's



really hard to develop any kind of meaningful specification for individuals to make bids upon. For example, you know, how do you...how do you determine in a competitive bidding situation somebody's architectural services or their services in terms of provision of legal services to the state and so forth. The primary opposition to this, its concept as I remember, maybe Representative Daniels and Jaffee will remember better than I as the Spokesman and Chairman of that Committee, was that...as worthy of an objective as competitive bidding is...and I really have been a pretty consistent supporter of that concept, that these are specialized services and just not meaningfully able to be...to be bid upon. As I said, John, I'm not going to oppose it but I think those are the considerations that I think people ought to have in mind when they go to vote on this."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. To follow up on Representative Johnson's question. It seems to me this might get us not only into the problems of trying to establish standards for the competitive bidding but also requiring, if one's looking for a particularly splendid building, a particularly nice piece of artwork, for example, to go with the lowest bidder. It seems to me that this is the kind of thing which gets us into trouble with the competitive bidding requirements and I would prefer a motion not to concur so that we might not find ourselves unable to go with the best in some situations where that's appropriate just because of the requirements of this kind of act."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think I could hardly disagree more with the previous Speaker. The State of Illinois



hasn't gone with the best since we built the Capitol about one hundred years ago. We have consistently turned out some of the most mediocre buildings that I can possibly imagine. If Ray Ewell were awake... well, excuse me, I guess he is...and if...Hi, Ray, excuse me. Now that I've got your attention, perhaps you will be willing to stand up and talk about your list of consulting contracts that is about six inches high for one year in the State of Illinois. If you want abuse in the State of Illinois, all you do is start looking at the contracts. The St. Louis Globe Democrat started looking at the contracts for the... for the Railroad Relocation Authority in East St. Louis and found none of them had been filed in a timely fashion. None of them, apparently, had been competitively bid. Now the Department of Transportation happens to have the best bidding procedure that exists, but nevertheless, it's not good enough. I think we ought to pass this."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevec, to close."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, I've had some friends of mine ask me to nonconcur on this and rather than go through a...a wrestling match over it, I'll now move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2411."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2411. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does not concur with Amendment #1. Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 2410, I'd like to have the same motion. There are two Amendments and one does cause some possible problems, Senate Amendment #1. But I'll nonconcur to both Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2410."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur on



Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2410. And on that motion..someone wanted to speak. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The House does nonconcur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2410. 1051, Representative Donovan."

Donovan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1051."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1051. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcurs."

Donovan: "Mr. Speaker, can...I move to concur on Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1051."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves to concur on Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 1051. Since this is not final action we can take a voice vote. All those in favor...is that not right? It would be...could be... if the Senate receded, that's right. All those in favor vote 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'."

Donovan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 8 'nays' and the House does concur on Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 1051. 2376, Betty Lou Reed. Is Reed back...she's gone. 490, Barnes. 1645, Dunn. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I hope that last Bill wasn't GOMHD consumer division money that we just concurred in, I don't guess it was. This is House Bill 1645, the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. And I move that we concur with Senate Amendments #1, 3 and 4. The result of those three Amendments that



were put on in the Senate takes out and reduces the appropriation for the department by five hundred and sixty-six thousand, four hundred and thirty-five dollars. Most of which is federal money that isn't available but for the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund and they found this out after it passed the...left the House and so the department concurs and urges that we accept the three Amendments. I'd urge that."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman..."

Dunn: "I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur ...wait until I state the motion. The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 3 and 4. And on that question, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I see another state department is moving to a new office building. I wonder where it's moving."

Speaker Flinn: "Turn Dunn on...Ralph."

Dunn: "Representative Skinner, on this Amendment 2, it appropriates fifty thousand dollars for moving but I've talked to Members of the Space Needs Commission and I'm not sure they're going to move. We could nonconcur on that and try to take it out if you'd like but...I...if we don't...if the Space Needs Commission, I think you're a Member of...aren't you, if they don't order to move, they would like to stay where they are."

Skinner: "Well, I just wondered whether we're buying the old Sears and Roebuck building or are we going to put a lease in here, are we going to get a lease signed that we're going to have to buy another building in Springfield like in Concordia?"

Dunn: "What I'd like to mention to the Body while we're here is that there is no sign that they're going to move. This money is appropriated because of some suggestion of someone of the Space Needs Commission."



I'd urge the Members to join me in saying that the executive offices of the directors of our Code Department ought to all be located in the State Office Building. I'd like to have the director where I can call him up or walk up or get on the elevator and go see him instead of hunting him up somewhere out in the boondocks around Springfield. And...so I would urge that...maybe if you'd like to start a letter writing campaign or call people up and say let's keep these directors where we can see them once in a while. But that I don't think is important on this, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think that Representative Dunn is trying to put anything over on us. But I didn't know that the Department of Corrections was moving until I saw it in the newspaper on June 8th. And I don't want to find out on June 10th that the Department of Mines and Minerals is all of a sudden moving into the Sears and Roebuck building down the street from the Kroger store. I really think that this ought to be taken out if they don't know what they're doing...or where they're going."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what troubles me is Amendment #3. And I rise on this floor as one that is very often supported the interests of the coal mining people in the State of Illinois because I feel like many of you that we ought to try to utilize Illinois coal. However, as I read Amendment ...Senate Amendment #3, it says the sum of one dollar. One dollar is appropriated from the Federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Fund of the Department of Mines and Minerals pursuant to an approved State Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program. Now what that Amendment is telling us is that we can only use federal



funds for a reclamation...mine reclamation program that is underground. And as I hear from everybody that the problems that we have as far as mine reclamation is the surface mining. That's the one that is the blight on our...on our countryside, the blight all over the lands in Illinois and other parts of the country. And I think that we are subverting a federal program for surface mining control and I think that we can't let the people who use our lands for mining...and not to have some obligation in this matter. So I think, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that we ought to nonconcur with this Amendment and send it back to the...to the House. I realize that Senator Buzbee is the Sponsor of this Amendment in the Senate and he ordinarily does a pretty good job of supporting the mining interest and I think I do a fair job for a fellow that comes from way up north. But I think that in this instances he's gone a little too far and that we ought nonconcur with this Amendment and put this Bill back in the posture and do a little more work on it."

Speaker Flinn: "For the purpose of the record, the Calendar is wrong. It's not 1, 2 and 3, it's 1, 3 and 4. Is that...Representative Wolf, is that what you arose for..."

Wolf: "Yes..."

Speaker Flinn: "...or did you want to speak?"

Wolf: "No, that's what...it was a parliamentary inquiry. I...I...my...shows 1, 2 and 3. Is it 1, 3 and 4?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Calendar is in error. It's 1, 3 and 4. Any further discussion? Representative Dunn to close. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would renew my motion to concur with these. I think that the reason there isn't any federal money in here is because we're not...the federal money is not



appropriated until the fiscal year and it wouldn't be available during this year. As soon as it is, why certainly we'll be back here and want to appropriate some of...but when it's not here...the Senate saw fit to take it out. That's the main reason, as I understand it, that they took out the seven hundred and fifty...five hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars. I...I join with all of you with the concern about any of the departments moving out of the State Office Building. But while the fifty thousand dollars is in here, I would...I would urge and do all I could to keep them from moving. I don't think it would hurt to approve this and I'd urge an 'aye' for concurrence of all three Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 3 and 4 on House Bill 1645. 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 62 'ayes', 78 'noes' and the motion to concur on these Amendments loses. Do you wish to make another motion, Representative Dunn? Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Ladies and Gentlemen, then I move not to concur..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on these three Amendments. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The House nonconcur on Amendments #1, 3 and 4 on House Bill 1645. House Bill 1386, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On House...on Senate Bill 1386, I move to recede from House Amendment 1 and House Amendment 3. The House...the House Bill had to do with amending the Fair Employment Practices Act. The two Amendments in which I asking...request that we recede, one is for



pending...not including pending claims. The reason I'm..."

Speaker Flinn: "What are the two Amendment numbers you wish to recede from?"

Hallstrom: "1 and 3, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "1 and 3."

Hallstrom: "Yes please."

Speaker Flinn: "Well no wonder. Okay, Senate Bill rather than House Bill. The Lady has moved to recede from House Amendments #1 and 3 from Senate Bill 1386. Any discussion? If not...Representative...Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "I was wondering if the Sponsor would yield."

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she will."

Bullock: "Representative Hallstrom, could you explain the Amendments that you're asking us to recede to as it relates to this Bill?"

Hallstrom: "Yes, I would be glad to, Representative Bullock. House Amendment...except for pending claims, in quotes ...Mr. Speaker, there's been a request that I take it out for a short period of time in order to come to it?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I want to let you know that there's a guy up there that's got a note up there and he went up there...Speaker of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hallstrom, do you want to take this out of the record momentarily you said? Out of the record."

Hallstrom: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record. House Bill 2766, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "House Bill 2766, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to..."



Madigan: "Let me explain the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay."

Madigan: "As the Bill passed the House, the exemption provided in the Bill could be cancelled and back taxes assessed if the property had a change in use or conversion to condominium. It was felt that this placed an unusual burden on the recorder of deeds. The Amendment requires the property owner to enter an upfront agreement with the county, which means the chief assessing official, a/copy ^{of} which is filed with the recorder of deeds. I move to concur in the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Amendment #2 to House Bill 2766. Representative Satterthwaite. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Madigan, does this apply statewide or to specific areas of the state?"

Madigan: "Statewide, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "And by this Senate Amendment we would be saying that someone who registers for a homestead exemption would then have some later commitment to come back to change that with the assessors office?"

Madigan: "The Bill creates a new homestead improvement exemption for units which range from five to fifty-five units. And the idea is that if you make substantial improvements in a property up to fifteen thousand dollars maximum in value for dwelling units, then there will be an exemption provided. This does not deal with the normal homestead exemption."

Satterthwaite: "My question, however, concerns the method by which one was qualified at the assessor's office for obtaining the exemption. I...I was just asking for a repeat of what you had said in your explanation."



I didn't understand what kind of change was being made in the way one...recorded it."

Madigan: "No, the change provided by the Senate Amendment treats the situation where there...where we were attempting to present a situation where a person would take advantage of the exemption and then sell the building. And...the method employed while the Bill was in the House was changed over in the Senate to provide that the exemption could be cancelled and the ...in the House we provided that the exemption could be cancelled and back taxes assessed. And the Amendment requires the property owner to enter an upfront agreement so that the...the intent of the Amendment is to provide more protection for the local assessing officials and the collectors."

Satterthwaite: "In the upfront agreement, what does one have to agree to do?"

Madigan: "That you will lose the tax benefits."

Satterthwaite: "If you sell the property?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Madigan: "I move to concur, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "We've got one more. Representative Telcser. Telcser."

Telcser: "I simply want to rise, Mr. Speaker, and to...to support the Gentleman's motion for concurrence. This Bill and another one are two Bills which are designed to encourage the rehabilitation of residential property. And I believe without the people who do the fixing up...suffering excessive tax burdens at reassessment time. And I rise to support the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2766. All in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'."



Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
The Clerk will take the...Represent...Representative
Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I want to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take
the record. The Gentleman has asked for a verification
of the Roll Call. Representative Madigan, do you wish
to poll the absentees? Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt. Borchers. Braun. Brummer.
Bullock. Capparelli. Collins. Dawson. Domico.
Donovan. Ebbesen."

Speaker Flinn: "Donovan, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Farley. Goodwin. Griesheimer."

Speaker Flinn: "Goodwin, 'aye'. Representative Bullock, 'aye'.
Bullock, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hallstrom. Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huff.
Keane. Klosak. Kosinski. Laurino. Lechowicz.
Leinenweber. McAuliffe. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster.
Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Neff. Pechous. Polk.
Reed. Robbins. Schisler. Schlickman."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Henry. Put Henry down 'aye'.
Wait till we get through the...wait till we get
through and then I'll recognize everybody."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele.
C. M. Stiehl. Taylor."

Speaker Flinn: "Taylor, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich. Winchester. Sam Wolf. No further."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Neff. Neff. Vote Neff 'no'.
Conti, 'no'. Boucek. Neff. Neff, 'aye'. You got
that backwards? No, no. Him, 'no'. Watson, 'no'.
Neff voted 'no'. I'm going to have to go a little
slower. Representative Braun. Vote 'aye'? 'Aye'.
Representative Huff, 'aye'. Brummer, 'aye'. Wikoff,
'no'. Campbell, 'no'. Frederick, 'no'. Going too
fast. I've got to slow down. Bower, 'no'. Johnson,



'no'. Boucek, 'no'. Bell...Boucek after Johnson.
 Bell, 'no'. Grossi, 'no'. Deuster, 'no'. Timothy
 Simms, 'no'. Swanstrom, 'no'. Walsh..."

Speaker Flinn: "Too fast."

Speaker Flinn: "Walsh is 'no'. We've got to let the Clerk
 keep up with us. I'll recognize you when they get
 caught up. I'll do it again. There's still a dozen
 people out there trying to change...let's take a new
 Roll Call. Dump the Roll Call. The question is,
 'Shall the House concur in...Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, please take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, apparently Mr. Ryan is tired. Apparent-
 ly, he's had a long day, and he needs a little rest
 and relaxation and whatever he does. So, maybe you'd
 wish to recognize our fine, outstanding, pleasant
 Minority Leader."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thanks very much, Mr. Speaker, and the Gentleman's
 absolutely right. I've put in a full day's work today,
 and I don't know what he's done. But, I do know that
 Speaker Redmond had his dinner, had his nap, has
 entertained everybody on the floor and in the balcony
 at our expense after telling us that we were going to
 have dinner at 8 o'clock. It's now 11 o'clock. We're
 trying to get through a couple of the pet Bills for
 Representative Madigan's friends, and that's why I now
 move to adjourn, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan. Representative
 Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, does he...does he request ^{his} / Republican
 Conference?"

Speaker Flinn: "Do you wish a Republican Conference?"

Ryan: "No, I won't give you the opportunity to turn me down
 again."



Speaker Flinn: "He doesn't want it now."

Madigan: "Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker. 10 a. m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adjourn
until 10 a. m. in the morning. All those in favor say
'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The House is adjourned.
10 a. m. tomorrow."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 29, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0021	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	93
	MOTIONS	PAGE	127
HB-0336	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	234
HB-0444	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	142
HB-0512	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	196
HB-0523	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	293
HB-0570	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	198
HB-0591	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	5
HB-0593	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
HB-0611	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	9
HB-0700	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	182
HB-0706	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	291
HB-0753	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	187
HB-0793	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	326
HB-0797	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	292
HB-0822	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	178
HB-0834	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	196
HB-0859	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	330
HB-0884	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	178
HB-0893	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	230
HB-0933	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	324
HB-1051	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	334
HB-1069	MOTIONS	PAGE	132
HB-1083	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
HB-1158	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
HB-1168	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-1211	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	189
HB-1276	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	212
HB-1351	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	43
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	44
HB-1382	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	5
HB-1477	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-1535	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	214
HB-1563	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	45
HB-1596	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	235
HB-1635	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	43
HB-1645	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	334
HB-1647	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	46
HB-1652	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	32
HB-1656	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	45
HB-1657	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	200
HB-1679	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	137
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	206

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
 JUNE 29, 1979

PAGE 2

HB-1682	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	51
HB-1768	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
HB-1774	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	149
HB-1777	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	150
HB-1902	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
HB-1916	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
HB-1936	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	291
HB-1986	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-2004	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	54
HB-2012	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	182
HB-2098	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	36
HB-2134	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	323
HB-2167	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	169
HB-2194	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
HB-2210	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	2
HB-2226	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
HB-2283	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	240
	MOTIONS	PAGE	255
HB-2298	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	199
HB-2301	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	158
HB-2321	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	153
HB-2355	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	155
HB-2377	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	294
HB-2378	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	297
HB-2410	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	333
HB-2411	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	330
HB-2420	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-2425	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	58
HB-2426	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	59
HB-2427	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	29
HB-2428	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	29
HB-2436	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	10
HB-2486	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	60
HB-2500	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	190
HB-2540	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	256
HB-2545	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	30
HB-2548	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	257
HB-2567	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	289
HB-2569	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	265
HB-2574	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	60
HB-2575	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	64
HB-2577	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	319
HB-2578	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	32

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 29, 1979

PAGE 3

HB-2579	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	29
HB-2642	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	325
HB-2678	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
HB-2679	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-2740	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	258
HB-2766	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	340
SB-0088	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	25
SB-0133	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	3
SB-0157	2ND READING	PAGE	304
	MOTIONS	PAGE	318
SB-0257	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	26
SB-0263	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	26
SB-0375	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	7
SB-0483	3RD READING	PAGE	66
SB-0484	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	302
SB-0487	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	327
SB-0533	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	301
SB-0563	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	91
SB-0577	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	26
SB-0578	3RD READING	PAGE	66
SB-0580	3RD READING	PAGE	67
SB-0581	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	304
SB-0584	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	31
SB-0588	3RD READING	PAGE	68
SB-0590	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	29
SB-0618	MOTIONS	PAGE	137
SB-0622	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	304
SB-0625	MOTIONS	PAGE	136
SB-0669	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	29
SB-0687	3RD READING	PAGE	67
SB-0830	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	31
SB-0891	2ND READING	PAGE	69
	MOTIONS	PAGE	70
	MOTIONS	PAGE	318
SB-0908	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	91
SB-0918	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	27
SB-0927	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	27
SB-0973	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	28
SB-1072	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	324
SB-1247	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	91
SB-1272	3RD READING	PAGE	92
SB-1320	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	304
SB-1325	CONFERENCE	PAGE	165

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 29, 1979

PAGE 4

SB-1340	MOTIONS	PAGE	135
SB-1386	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	338
SB-1395	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	141
SB-1423	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	168
HR-0419	3RD READING	PAGE	39

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 29, 1979

PAGE 5

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND-HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER-PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIENCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	129
HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED	PAGE	344