

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

Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen. Oh, Lord bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. The Book of Ecclesiastes closes with these words: 'Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; Fear God and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it is good or whether it be evil.' Let us pray; Heavenly Father, who art our Creator, our Life, our source of all power and might, we do praise Thy Holy Name for all the blessings which have been ours to share as we have served in this House of Representatives for the State of Illinois. While in these closing hours we have yet much to accomplish, may we look back upon a record that has won favor with Thee for the good of our fellow men. May equity and justice have been fairly served. May prudence and propitiation have been administered. And finally, Oh, Lord, may we rest from our labors in knowledge that we have served Thee and Thy law for the greater and better good of the people of this state. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen. And now, on this final day, may I take a moment to personally express my appreciation for having been enabled to serve as your Chaplain this Session. It has been an enlightening and rewarding experience, filled with many acts of personal kindness and of the even greater pleasure to meet with you and share our prayer each day. As you

leave may God be in your heart and in your mind and always and in all ways, at your side. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, do you have your morning words of praise today?"

Friedrich: "I'd like to say a few words in behalf of Father Krueger. I think that he has been a great blessing to us and I think that before we enter on any work and any worthwhile project, you ought to invoke the blessing of duty, and Father Krueger has certainly done that well. He's been here punctual and steadfast. And I think we owe him a great, great debt of gratitude."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I guess I was beaten to the punch. But, I do want to add to that and say that I've had this about ten years here at morning services of this nature and the father has been reasonably short and to the point and I thought... and I think has done a very excellent job. I can recall a few in the past who droned on and on until we were disgusted. And I was afraid to say something or other, but never did. I guess it was his holy cloth or something or other. However, I do think he's been very, very good and I want to thank him also."

Speaker Redmond: "Father told me that the prayer was short

because the objective was only a very short distance away from the Members. Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I, too, feel that we should express our gratitude to Father Krueger in always praying for this General Assembly. I think going back over the years it seems to me that I always refer in this particular instance when Father Krueger is up there, that a quote from William Penn that says, 'If you are not governed by God, you will be ruled by tyrants'."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 944, Hallstrom, I think. Stiehl? C.M. Stiehl. House Resolution 945, Murphy. 946, Deuster-Friedrich. 948, Donovan. 949, Oblinger. Okay, take 944 out: House Resolution 950, Meyer. 952, Winchester. 953, Christensen. 954, Preston. 955, Conti. 956, O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 945 by Murphy calls for the ceiling on service taxes. 946 by Deuster lauds the President of the Lake County Bar Association. 948 by Donovan asks that aliens pay the like amount in' capital gains. Oblinger tells about the Tour of Independence Day in 949. 950 by Meyer notes the 50th anniversary. 952 by Winchester tells the score between the Senate-House Secretaries softball game. Christensen parties the second annual in Tusca Rose. Preston's 954 records a marriage. Conti in 955 asks the Space Needs Commission for elevator Acts and answers. And 956 by O'Brien notes the closing of Tuscany Bakery. And I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Resolutions are adopted. Roll Call for attendance. Your own switch only. Take the record. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 947, Pullen, with respect to the memory of James McGlade of Park Ridge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Clerk might read the Resolution honoring James McGlade, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 947. Whereas, James McGlade of Park Ridge, Illinois, son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas McGlade, beloved brother of Tom McGlade, passed away on May 14, 1980, at the age of 17; and whereas, during his ravaging illness he was president of his senior class, a representative for student council at Maine South High School, and was quite active in other school functions; and whereas, his interest in sports was apparent by his participation in football, in which he was named "all-conference", and in track, and because of his athletic involvement and leadership qualities, Jim was elected president of the Letterman's Club; and whereas, when Jim physically could no longer participate in sports, he became a trainer, showing his desire to keep going and giving his one hundred percent; and whereas, Jim was awarded numerous awards by his fellow classmates such as 'Best Leader', 'Most Courageous', and 'Most Likely to be Remembered' and was named a recipient of a Good Will Award; and whereas, Jim was awarded the Maine

South Century III scholarship and was admitted to Northwest (sic) University; and whereas, Jim's interest in the field of art brought him three awards and his leadership qualities guided him as Art Club president; and whereas, Jim received a language award through the school's French Club and was active in Pep Club and Ski Club; and whereas; Jim fought a long hard struggle with cancer with pride and dignity, showing the true meaning of those words by his participation in even more school events in his senior year while fighting for his life; and whereas, Jim McGlade set forth an example of the meaning of love, courage, faith, strength, and eternal optimism for everyone to abide by, and he stood and still stands tall as a teacher of values and morals to his friends, his lessons taught by actions, not words; now, therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we do mourn the passing of Jim McGlade and at the same time we do celebrate his life and express gratitude to his Maker for having created Jim McGlade and to his parents for having reared their son as a strong, determined young man of faith and courage; and be it further resolved, that suitable copies of this preamble and Resolution be forwarded to Mr. and Mrs. Thomas McGlade and to South Maine High School."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, thank you, and I thank the House for its attention. This Resolution was written by one of Jim's classmates whom I had the privilege of bringing

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

to Springfield a couple of weeks ago as an aid, and he specifically asks, since he knows our procedures here, that this Resolution be read in full before what he called a 'hushed' House. So Scott, we've given you a 'hushed' House. Scott Hall wrote the Resolution because he was a very close friend of Jim McGlade, and he knew what Jim's passing and what his life meant to all his classmates at Maine South, to his entire community of Park Ridge and the surrounding area, and to everyone who had any contact with Jim McGlade. Mr. Speaker, there was a column by Bob Green in the Tribune not long after Jim passed away which expressed a great deal of how the community felt about this young man, and I wonder if I might have leave of the House to read this column?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Leave is granted."

Pullen: "The title is 'He Didn't Graduate But He Had Honors'. When the 730 graduating seniors at Maine South High School in Park Ridge walk into the football stadium for commencement exercises Wednesday evening it will be without the usual giddiness that accompanies the end of school. Jim McGlade, the seventeen-year-old class president will not be delivering the speech that he was scheduled to make, and the seniors all know it. Jim McGlade died on May 14. He had cancer. You hear about young people getting the disease once in a while, of course, but when it happens to someone like Jim McGlade, it still makes you question the justice of life. Jim was one of those high school students who aren't supposed to exist in the angel dust age. His accomplishments

sound like something out of an old time teenage novel, president of the senior class, football player, member of the track team, president of the Letterman's Club, Student Council representative, Key Club, Pep Club, honor student, winner of awards for excellence in art and French. In his sophomore year, he won an award for quote 'teaching friendship and brotherly love', unquote, to others around him. In January of 1979 during the big snow storm, Jim was outside his house in Park Ridge helping his dad shovel the driveway. He came inside with his head throbbing. He was feeling blurry eyed and dizzy. 'Mom, I can't stand it', he said. 'I don't know what it is.' His parents, Thomas and Joyce McGlade, were alarmed. Jim was a weight lifter, a natural athlete, and he was virtually never sick. At first they thought there might be something wrong with his eyes to be giving him trouble with his vision. They took him to a series of doctors. It wasn't the eyes. There were tumors on Jim's brain. The cancer did its work swiftly. Before long it had spread to his lymph glands, his liver, his neck, his chest, his lungs, and his hips. He underwent chemotherapy treatments. The chemicals and the cancer devastated Jim McGlade. His athlete's body dwindled away. The treatment made his hair fall out. He didn't hide. Often using crutches, he went to school every day he could. 'The kids will either like me the way I am, or they won't', is how he explained it to his parents. 'He was such a fighter', said Clyde Watson, the principal of Maine South. He was going to whip it, and that was it. I'd see him in the hallway.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Here was a boy who was one of our toughest football players a year and a half ago and now he was having to try to defeat this disease. It broke your heart, but it inspired you at the same time, He would go to the hospital for periodic blood transfusions, always though, he would return to the hallways of Maine South. He had been accepted at Northwestern University, and he was looking forward to joining his older brother there. He knew though that he might not have time. He went to school until two months before he died. When he went into the hospital for the last time, he began to work on his speeches he was supposed to make at senior honors day and at graduation. The speeches were part of the class president's duties. On the evening of May 13, Principal Watson went to visit Jim in the hospital. When he walked into the room he found Jim sitting on the edge of the bed, bent over, his head on the nurse's lap being fed oxygen through a mask. It was the only position in which he could breath. Jim looked up. 'Dr. Watson', he said, but could not manage any more words. The next day Jim's family gathered in the room. He was gasping the way he had done when he used to work out for athletics. The cancer was suffocating him. 'Mom, I'm having a hard time breathing' he said. They were with him when he died. On the first night of visitation at the funeral home, there was an hour's wait to get inside. Some 3000 students go to Maine South. Most of them came to honor Jim McGlade. Last week was the senior honors assembly. Margaret 'Hiceto' is the vice..the class vice-president, gave

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the speech that Jim was supposed to make. He had been conscientious to the end. In the hospital he had written down a series of notes for Margaret, and she read them to the class. 'You should always be proud of yourself' is one of the messages he sent. And so on Wednesday night, the graduates of Maine South High School will march into the football stadium to end the first part of their lives and begin the rest. In the stands, sitting there as if Jim were going to march up and receive his diploma, will be Thomas and Joyce McGlade. They aren't quite sure why they will be there, but they have decided that it is right. 'School was so important to him', Mrs. McGlade said. 'Graduation would have meant so much to him. Ever since he was a little boy we would never miss seeing anything he was involved in. It would have been important to him that we be there on the night he graduated, and so we will', Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I thank you for the opportunity to bring to your attention the life and the passing of Jim McGlade who will stand as a symbol of courage and faith to all who knew him. His passing is an example of the fact that the wisdom of the Lord is greater than the wisdom of any of us can know. And we cannot question, but we cannot understand. Thank you for helping me honor him. I move the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond; "The question's on the Lady's motion for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried, and the Resolution is adopted. Is

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

there any ...On the Order of Concurrence, any Member that wants to move to nonconcur? Representative Skinner? You stood like you were... Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think I have a noncontroversial Conference Committee report if I may present it to the Body. It's Senate Bill 1510. The Conference Committee encompasses everything that was in the Bill that ... to refresh your memories, the Bill is one that would give township elections the option of nominating by primary or caucus whichever the township central Committee should decide in townships of excess of 25,000. There was no controversy on the Bill. There was an Amendment dealing with township assessors. Representative Skinner objected, his objection being that if it was made to apply to Cook County only, he'd have no problem with the Bill. The Bill...The Conference Committee does make the ..the provision applicable only to Cook County, and in light of that, I would ask for the adoption of Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1510."

Speaker Redmond: "It appears on page four under Conference Committee reports. Representative Collins has moved that the House adopt the First Conference Committee report to Senate Bill 1510. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McMaster: "Phil, as I understand you to say, we have worked hard a week or two ago to get this delay on the implementation of the multi-township assessors put in

as an Amendment. And now you're telling me that that has been taken out. And you're thinking only of Cook County. I want you to know and I want Mr. Skinner to know, that many of the downstate assessors are completely against this in spite of what he might think. For that reason, Phil, I can't support the Concurrence on this report and I'm sorry if you took that delay out for the downstate counties as well. But, I don't know. I sometimes think all you people care about is Cook County rather than downstate. And certainly Cal, evidently, does not care about downstate counties."

Collins: "Well, Representative McMaster, I only acceded to this request because this was a tack-on to a Bill that had no controversy attached to it. We were accommodating a Member on our side of the aisle who had a problem within Cook County. I would have no difficulty supporting your position. I would be happy to do so. But I was trying to ease the passage of another Member's Bill, a Senator, with this Amendment on that which did cause some controversy when we went through the first time, as you recall. If there were another Bill that would deal with the situation downstate, I would support your position. And I have no difficulty doing so. I'm only trying to pass a Bill and accommodate a Member of our Leadership and that is the reason for the Conference Committee report. It's by no means an expression of my personal philosophy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House, I didn't get in on the conversation. I heard the House Bill number called so I missed most of the conversation that was going on. I felt that changing the effective date would be good for Cook County or the rest of the state. However, there's some Senators across the aisle that didn't feel the same. They had no objections if we would eliminate counties over 25,000 or make it for Cook County only. And, as the Sponsor of the Bill said, we're trying to accommodate a few people in Cook County and for that reason, we accepted this. I would be most happy, Mr. McMaster, if you want to put in the Bill or whatever you can do in the near future to help those downstaters, I would be happy to be the Sponsor, the Cosponsor, with you. But for this time, I would like to see this Bill passed, to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Conti, I read the analysis on this, and how did you possibly get mixed up with the downstate tax assessors in this election Bill? Now, this is something that's been going on in Election Committee for a long time. There's only two Members not in Cook County on the Election Board and you're always shoving stuff down our throat for downstate. Why don't you mind your own business in Cook County and let us run downstate? I think ... I can't possibly conceive how you could amend that Bill on there. You exempted Cook County on the tax assessors and then shoved it down our throat on the downstate ones."

Conti: "Now, Mr. Friedrich, you might be misunderstanding the whole Amendment. All the Amendment does is

change the effective date. You still have to qualify. We have not done a thing to downstate. We haven't changed the context of the Bill at all. All we're doing, my Amendment, all that does is change the effective date."

Friedrich: "Well, why do we have one set of rules for Cook County and another one for qualifying...85. You know by 85 you can change the law four times. But you've got us up then for next year."

Conti: "That's the question, Representative, I've been asking down here for a good 20 years. I don't know why, but Representative Skinner asked to opt out Cook County and to leave the rest of the state alone. So, I'm catching hell from both sides...from downstate and..."

Friedrich: "Well, I don't know why you put that in the Conference Committee at all. The Bill had nothing to do with tax assessors. And you know it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, is this Conference Committee report been distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes. Representative Collins?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I thought this was noncontroversial. I think it could be if I could address myself to Representative Friedrich. The provisions that ..to which he referred..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, Representative Collins is addressing you."

Collins: "Dwight, the provisions to which you refer are already law which were encompassed in a Bill handled by Representative Campbell earlier. This Bill does,

in no way, change anything that is already law downstate, but it is an attempt to delay the effective date. There were objections from downstaters as to delaying the effective date of that law. So, because Representative Conti's problem was Cook County only, we made it apply only to Cook County. We're not fooling around with the law downstate. As a matter of fact, the Bill, as it initially was amended, did change it statewide. Because of objections that came from a number of people, we addressed the problem that was in Representative Conti's mind, which was merely a Cook County problem. But it does not ... it does not fool around with multi-township assessors. That's already in the law."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich..."

Collins: "If you want to change that law, I would be happy to help you."

Friedrich: "Sure. When? It'll be a year now before you can change it and you know it. The problem, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, around here, we go through Committee hearings and spend hours worrying about a comma or something else and then we finally send it to a Conference Committee and ten guys decide what the Bill does. And they amend everything on it that's been beaten in the last year and I don't know why we go through the legislative process. Why don't we just appoint a bunch of Conference Committees and then concur in the Conference Committees and go home? We could have saved six months around here instead of going through Committee hearings and arguments on the floor, debating Amendments and everything else. This

is the most absurd process I've ever seen. I've seen stuff come up around here the fourth time for no good reason and somewhere along the line, we've got to change this procedure. I don't like it. There's 177 Members in this House and invariably it's a bunch of guys from Cook County that decide what's good for downstate. And I'm getting tired of it for one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman from Cook County, the two Legislators on this side of the aisle, made the statement that they would like to help us downstate correct something that we feel should be corrected. For their information, I think there are some of us downstate, who helped us put that Amendment on, that corrected it for Cook County and all of the state. And we helped you do that. And then you turn around and go to Conference Committee and let a small group of people knock out what we have done for downstate or only leave in what we had done for Cook County. And that's why I'm objecting. I'm not objecting to the Cook County delay, but I think we should have the same rights downstate as Cook County has. What makes us different than you people?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Let me answer that. In Cook County, the assessors don't assess. In downstate Illinois, they do assess. And so it makes sense to me that the assessors in Cook County have no qualifications whatsoever other than being a citizen and over 21 years of age. In downstate Illinois, the assessors are responsible for spreading the tax burden, the property tax burden, and

they are not doing a good enough job yet. And it has occurred...It occurred to Senator Clark's Committee eight years ago that there should be pre-election qualifications for assessors. Now, in negotiations with the Township Officials Association, golly, I think it was four years ago or three years ago, they decided, let's just do the big ones first. We figured if you ...that an assessor could do the most damage in a larger township. And certainly if one has a township of over 25,000 people, one has a larger township. Coincidentally, it also is a fact that the assessment in the largest townships downstate are the best in the state. They're much better than in Cook County where the county assessor does them. And so, there are very few assessors downstate who are not skillful..skilled enough to pass this rinky-dink little test that the Illinois Property Tax Institute issues. I passed the test. I believe, Representative Oblinger has passed the test. Representative Farley has passed the test. The Gentleman arguing against this Amendment could surely pass the test, if they were willing to spend about four days of intensive study. I assure the Members of the General Assembly that if your assessor be from a large township or a small township, can't pass this test, you don't want that assessor assessing your property because he won't know ..he or she won't know up from down. Incidentally some of the best assessors in the state are women. Now, Representative Collins has not given you the straight out flat reason why it won't make any difference what we do in this House. This

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

qualification is not going to be taken out by the Senate. There is a Senator over there whom I will be happy.. or Representative Collins will be happy to identify, who will not allow this to pass because he's having a vicious fight with one of his ..one of his assessors in one of his large townships. And it just is not going to pass over there. If you want to kill the Bill, that's fine. It doesn't make any difference to me."

McMaster: "Well, Cal. Thank you."

Skinner: "The status quo will be still be there."

McMaster: "Thank you, Cal. There's several things you brought up. In other words what you're saying, one of the reasons for this Bill and one of the reasons for it being the way it is is because of one specific fight between one specific Senator and one specific tax assessor. Another thing, I think that you have given us a little information on, Cal. You've said that Cook County assessors don't do a damn thing. That's fine, Phil and Elmer. Let's just knock out the Cook County assessors then. You want us to do that? How would you like that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "There is one thing that you're talking about here, the ability to pass the test. There is another thing, that's the ability to have common sense in assessing. You can mechanically assess pieces of property and you can use common sense in assessing pieces of property. Common sense you can't put in a test. And, this is one of the things that has happened in southern Illinois. They try to use common sense and reason in

assessing the property and in Cook County, why they assess it in blocks. Now, I don't think that we need to go to this type of assessing in southern Illinois, this type of assessor requirements. And I... If it's a two person fight over there on this Bill let's send it back to them and let them fight it out. Let's refuse to recede on this Senate Amendment. If a Bill isn't good enough for all of the state on assessing, it surely shouldn't apply to Cook County."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I apologize. I thought that this was going to be noncontroversial. All I can say to the Gentlemen who are raising opposition to this..to this Conference Committee report is this, that if we come back with a second Conference Committee report this provision will not be in the Bill. I promise you. If we will...We will not deal with downstate. We will not deal with Cook County. We will not deal with assessors at all. I was trying to accommodate a friend of mine who has a particular problem. This Bill could not pass the Senate in the form it went over there. And, Mr. Speaker, because of the unexpected opposition I wonder if you would let me take this out of the record at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Any other noncontroversial items? On the Order of Nonconcurrency on page three, Senate Bill 1624. Representative Karpel is recognized. Karpel."

Karpel: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to not recede from Senate Amendment #1

on Senate Bill 1624."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1624. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. And the House refuses to recede. On Senate Bill 1664, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move that the House do not recede from House Amendments to Senate Bill 1664 and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments to Senate Bill 1664. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. And the House refuses to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 1664. Is McGrew here? How about 1728, Representative Watson? Don't want to call that one? How about 1799? Representative Greiman? Proceed."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do not recede from House Amendments to House .. to Senate Bill 1799. Respectfully request that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1799. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The House refuses to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1799. And a Conference Committee is requested. Let the

record show that Representative Walsh is in the chamber. Former Representative Geo-Karis is in the chamber. She's already used the phone and she wants to know if anybody wants to hear her sing. She sang last night. Anybody want to hear her sing? Representative Daniels will you ferret out Joe McGah? He's looking for you. Would you repeat that Representative Greiman? On the Order of Concurrence, page three, House Bill 3429. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The powers that be and everybody have sit down and we have looked at this Bill and the Senate Amendments satisfy everybody's concerns. I'm going to move to concur in Senate Amendments 1,2, and 3. Senate Amendment 1 amends the Criminal Code to remove the requirement that Chief Circuit Judge must personally approve the legal fees in excess of the statutory maximum.. minimum for attorneys appointed by the court. And I think that's appropriate because what that in essence means is that the trial Judge rather than the Chief Circuit Judge does it. And the trial Judge has the review, has the ability to make the review. Senate Amendment 1 (sic) expands the entities which can purchase from prison industries and the effect of that Amendment should be to improve the operation of the prisons and to give them something to keep busy at so they won't riot. Senate Amendment 3 is an Agreed Resolution. The....part of the County Hospital problem which has the effect of letting inmates treated at Cook County Hospital in excess of 2500 be reimbursed by Public Aid. There's no

controversy on that either. I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendments 1,2, and 3."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur...Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate it and I'm sure the other Members would that, that in these concurrences, that if the Members would explain the original Bill and the other Amendments. It's not just on this one Amendment that we'll be voting on, but this would appear to be final action. And, I think it would help us if we knew what the original Bill was. He did a job explaining the Amendments, but not the original Bill."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir, Representative Darrow. I apologize. What the original Bill does and it's been nonaffected by the Amendments, the original Bill corrects a problem identified by the Auditor General and the operation of the Corrections Department. It seems that the Department has a practice actually authorized in substantive statute, of providing a travel allowance on a loan basis to inmates when they're released so they can go home. However, they've been charging it to a particular fund. The Auditor General discovered that there was no authorization for that fund. So what we do here is set up a fund with specific authorization to make that charge to this fund. And there's been no controversy on that that I'm aware of."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's ...shall

the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 of House Bill 3429? Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 3 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1,2 and 3 to House Bill 3429. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary inquiry. I understood the House rules provided that all Members had to wear an undershirt. And there's a Gentleman from the First District sitting in his seat with a crown on his head that doesn't have an undershirt on and I wondered why the Sergeant of Arms allowed him to take the floor because as I recall, the Rules Committee put that in our rules, that all Members must wear undershirts. Is that true or not true?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. We had a motion on the dress code and I didn't think it passed. Anyway I think when everybody saw the hair on that chest they were afraid to interfere with him anyway. Representative Katz on personal privilege."

Katz: "Yes....."

Speaker Redmond: "...You're ineligible till next year, you know that."

Katz: "Yes. Well, Mr. Krska, it was Mr. Cullerton and me and then Mr. Krska. We've got a sort of way that we're going to be handling it the next few years. Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from White doesn't understand that under our tradition of law, the king is above the law, Mr. Speaker. And..."

Pierce: "God save the king. God help the queen."

Katz: "And, Mr. Speaker, this is just one way of really showing that the year ahead is for the senior citizens. And this is sort of a last dying gasp, Mr. Speaker, as I enter senior citizenship."

Pierce: "I heard that was two years ago."

Katz: "Well, I gasped two years ago, but by the time the night is over, I will be gasping even more. Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how this will go in Winnetka, but for these few blessed moments, I'm glad to be entering senior citizenship in this kind of manner. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Kosiowski: "Now that Mr. Katz has become macho, I would like to inquire as to whether he'd like to buy some more gold chains to hang around his neck."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, when I first looked over there and saw the crowned head, I looked very closely. And I still am looking closely. And I have decided and can prove if I bring the picture from home that this is... that he's a very close resemblance and possibly a reincarnation of Edward the II of the House of Pantagenet and I think upon that basis, that perhaps he should continue to wear that crown cap."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz, the king."

Katz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to correct the distinguished Gentleman from Decatur. It's actually the reincarnation of King Harald the First. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to plea to the women

Legislators that there be a little affirmative action in the contest next year. I really think that having two Democrats elected Mr. Wonderful in a row or selected Mr. Wonderful sort of points toward bias and discrimination on the part of the women Legislators. Now, it would seem to me that since the majority of the women Legislators are Republicans, they ought to be able to find at least one Republican who is worthy of that title some time during the first three years of the contest..."

Speaker Redmond: "They've despaired.."

Skinner: "Don't you think so?"

Speaker Redmond: "They've despaired..."

Skinner: "If it's fair?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, I say, they have despaired. They looked over the crop..."

Skinner: "Well, what can I say?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, I just want to suggest to King Katz that he may wear the crown here, but he'll still have to put his clothes on if he goes through the Senate door."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I would like to remind Harold Katz, the reincarnation of the House of Pantagenet, he's wrong in relation to Harold. But remember, Harold, uneasy lies the crown. Uneasy lies the head that wears the golden or silver crown."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, are you seeking recognition? Looks like you were poisoned. That was a nice song last night, but you didn't sing it very

well. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "You'll be sorry. Mr. Speaker, we were going to sing a song to you last night, but you seem to have taken a walk and you weren't there at the time. So you lucked out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey?"

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think he kind of let us down last night because a lot of Members of this House don't remember the days that you used to sing out with Minnie Pearl out there at the Black Angus everynight. Billie Redmond would go out and sing his song. And, he has a beautiful voice, but he keeps it hidden from us now that he's got so high in the ...and sits up there in the high and mighty seat."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'll tell you what happened..."

Huskey: "But we do remember you when you were one of us, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I really wasn't too bad and then they elected 'Tipword' and 'Tip' was too good for me. And I was about ready to reenter the starting box and then you unveiled Dick Kelly last night so I think I'm probably going to be retiring. Didn't Kelly turn out pretty good last night? Kent. Yeah. Representative George Ray Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask you what your ruling would be this morning relevant to some limited picture taking on the House floor? If there ever was a subject for a little snapshot it has to be Representative Katz at this point and I wondered if ..if I could have permission maybe to go over there and shoot him?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll leave that up to Mr. Katz. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the Members of the House that the US Supreme Court has just upheld the Leinenweber equivalent of the Hyde Amendment which bans medicaid abortions in Illinois. And I would like to congratulate Representative Leinenweber and congratulate all the unborn children who will be saved by this great humanitarian act."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton. Cullerton? What time do you think that the fifth race will get away today? The one in which you're entered."

Cullerton: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that approximately 4:00 o'clock if we are in a position where we're waiting around for Conference Committees to come back or legislative compromises to be worked out that we can go to the Order of Impersonations at about 4:00 o'clock, between 4:00 and 4:30 and hopefully we can get the Senate to concur with that time and Representative Matijevich would be the master of ceremonies. About 4:00 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I wonder if Representative Cullerton would amend his suggestion so that we could go to the Order of both Impersonations and Music?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that that's satisfactory to him."

Cullerton: "Not if it's what they called music last night."

Speaker Redmond: "We're going to use the same text, but different performers. "

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could inquire of Mr. Redmond or anyone else...It would seem to me to be real helpful if we're not going to be too busy if we would just have a recess for an hour or something for lunch so we know what we're doing. We're sitting around and obviously we're going to waste an hour anyway. It would be kind of nice to go somewhere and have lunch without ordering at our desks."

Speaker Giorgi: "I'll check with that immediately. House will be in recess till 1:00 p.m. sharp. Representative McGrew up for a motion."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do not recede from Amendments 1 and 3, the Illinois State Scholarship Commission."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves that the House do not recede ..What Bill number is that?..."

McGrew: "That's Senate Bill 1578." Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves that the House does not recede from Amendments #1 and 4 (sic) ..."

McGrew: "And ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "You've heard the motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. So ordered."

McGrew: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers?"

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to congratulate you upon not having your face in the paper in the same position as Representative Hoffman. I never saw a more .. a better man to receive the silver cup for being an ugly face and an ugly Representative than that picture in

day and I thank you for giving me the opportunity just to say hello. Allow my expression of gratitude for having the opportunity to come back here and work in Illinois for the schools. I'm delighted to be back home and among fellow Illinoisians. I'm looking forward to an opportunity to working very, very closely with the Legislature as we work toward what I hope will be our mutual goals for the benefit of kids in the school system in the State of Illinois. Thanks a lot. Glad to see you and best wishes on reaching a closing time with everything just like you want it. Thank you. I don't want to talk about bilingual."

Speaker Redmond: "Forgot to mention that he was formerly a Democratic precinct Committeeman of Coles County. Representative Polk."

Polk: "And also a delegate to the national convention, the Democratic national convention in 1970."

Speaker Redmond: "And I understand he almost ran for superintendent of public instruction."

Polk: "And I understand he would have been elected if he would have ran."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he's a Democrat. So we'd elect him. And he knew that Joe Lucco was the coach. Want to do it now? Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "All of the Members have just.. We've just distributed a Conference Committee history report which if you're not familiar with it, I'll try to explain it to you. This is time dated. The one you received was printed at 1:58 p.m., June 30th. On it appears all of the House Bills and Senate Bills that are to the point of one House refusing to recede from

the paper. So I want to.. I think you're lucky to have your face turned the other way."

Speaker Redmond: "He refuses to have his picture taken with me when we both face the camera."

Borchers: "That's smart on your part."

Speaker Redmond: "Schlickman is a different story. Representative George Ray Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, my seatmate here I feel has been maligned a little bit. Now, one might describe that picture... We might describe the expression here as disconsolate perhaps. But ugly, never. Ugly, never."

Speaker Redmond: "The third Member of the 40th District."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that picture of Representative Hoffman was on election night when he learned that he was reelected to another term."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Members please come to order? I have the distinct privilege and pleasure of presenting to the Members of the House, Donald G. Gill, who has been selected by the State Board of Education to be Illinois's second appointed state superintendent of education. He was born and educated in Illinois. He was 24 years as an Illinois teacher, school administrator, and professor. He's now superintendent of one of the nation's 100 largest school systems in Florida. He was born in O'Fullon, St. Clair County, a graduate of O'Fullon High School. Bachelor's degree in Illinois College and a Master's and Doctorate in education from the University of Illinois. May I present Donald G. Gill?"

Gill: "Thank you. Thank you. It's a distinguished pleasure to be here to talk with you today on your very busy

Amendments. The Bill will then be picked up on this report. Once a Bill is completed, that is, either receding from Amendments, or Conference Committees being adopted by both Houses, that Bill will be deleted from this report. It will disappear automatically on the next printing. To follow the remarks through one Bill, if you want to follow House Bill 1051 which has several remarks on it, it shows you the House Sponsor, the Senate Sponsor and the short title of the Bill. The first line of dates across the top, 29 June '79, was when the House refused to recede from Amendments or the House nonconcurrent, excuse me. The next column is when the Senate refused to recede and requested a Conference Committee. June 1st is when the House Conference Committee was appointed, excuse me, July 1st. next column is when the Senate Conference Committee was named, that was June 30th. The House report submitted was 1, July. The Senate report was submitted 1 July. And the House action on 1 July failed. The House action in the Senate, it was adopted. Since it failed in one House, we then go down to the next line of figures and it shows your second Conference Committee. The Senate requested a Conference Committee July 1st. Since it failed, the House appointed July 1st. The Senate appointed July 1st. The House report was submitted July 1st. The Senate report has not been submitted to date. The House adopted the Con...the Second Conference Committee July 1st. If there's any questions on reading the form, come up to the Clerk's desk and we'll be happy to help you."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Concurrence on page three, appears House Joint Resolution 104 for concurrence in the Senate Amendment 1. Representative Schlickman is recognized."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Joint Resolution 104 is the one that is mandated by the statutes providing that there shall be created a Joint Committee to draft the arguments against the proposition for single member districts and the abolition of cumulative voting. HJR 104 as it was adopted by this House provided for a reporting date of June 27th, 1980. The Senate wisely amended this Resolution to provide for reporting date of today so that the report can be presented to the House for its acceptance. Waiting till after the November elections would be too late unless a Special Session were called between today and after the November elections. I therefore, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, would move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 104."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 'aye'...104 'aye' and 5 'no'. And the motion carried. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Joint Resolution 104. Page two on the Order of Nonconcurrence appears House Bill 1407. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 1407."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1407. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. And the House refuses to concur. The existing lights adequate? Are the existing lights adequate? How old are you? As old as the hills."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain?"

McClain: "Are we in Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "Sure."

McClain: "I can move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1559. And ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Which number is that?"

McClain: "Refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1559 which is the substantive language for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. And I would ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1559. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. And the House refuses to recede from Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1559. Request a Conference Committee. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Have a coffee with cream here on the Republican side. You?"

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Concurrence on page two, appears House Bill 3026. Representative Hallock. Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move that we concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 16 to House Bill 3026 which is the PY '81 appropriation for the Department of Commerce."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Could you summarize for us the effects of these Amendments?"

Hallock: "Want them one by one?"

Schlickman: "No, just generally speaking if you would."

Hallock: "Well, overall, a few of the Amendments had broken up the Department in certain areas. We have added a couple of new positions for the overseas offices. We have eliminated a few CETA positions. And..."

Schlickman: "The net effect by...Do these Amendments constitute a reduction or an increase in the appropriation to this state agency?"

Hallock: "This is about.. Overall, it's about 1.1 million decrease."

Schlickman: "In other words, this is a reduction from what we originally passed?"

Hallock: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 16 to House Bill 3026. Those in favor vote 'aye';

opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and 9 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 16 to House Bill 3026. Representative J.J. Wolf is the winner of quiz number four. J.J. Wolf on the floor? You.. You won quiz number four. Now, if you'll come here I'll give you your prize. Representative J.J. Wolf was the winner of quiz number four so I'm going to present him his prize. Let the record show that Representative Walsh is in the chamber. You get those Phil? Who, Phil did? House Calendar Supplemental #1. Conference Committee reports, appears House Bill 3160. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House adopt the First Conference Committee report to House Bill 3160."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I wonder if the Gentleman could explain what the report does?"

Garmisa: "The Conference Committee recommends that the House concur in Senate Amendments #3 and #5. And in Senate Amendment #3, that was offered by Senator Schaffer, this Amendment would provide that whenever a suburban RTA Board vacancy exists for longer than four months, the new Director is to be appointed by Members of the General Assembly who represent the area affected by the vacancy. In order to qualify as a voting legislative Member, the area affected by the vacancy must comprise more than one-half of the Legislative

District. And, Senate Amendment #5 that was offered by Senator Bloom, that would prohibit the RTA Board from selling bonds or notes by negotiated sale without advertising for bids. And it would also provide that notice of the sale shall be given by proper publication. The.. It also provides that the Senate should recede from Senate Amendment #4 and the provisions and intent of this Amendment are included in the Amendment provided in the Conference Committee report. And the further Amendment of House Bill 3160 is as follows: the authority of the RTA to issue 100 million working cash fund bonds or notes is removed from the Bill and instead the RTA is granted authority to issue on or before December 31 of 1980 seventy-five million in tax anticipation notes that would be called 1980 interim financing notes in order to cover the RTA cash flow difficulties that are incurred on or prior to that date. 1980 interim financing notes are not to be issued for a term longer than one year. The proceeds from these notes maybe used to pay operating expenses of the RTA including payments owed through transportation carriers pursuant to grants and/or purchase of service agreements. The .. It further provides that the RTA's existing bond authorization of \$500,000,000 is hereby reduced to \$425,000,000. And this authorization plus the seventy-five million in 1980 interim financing notes keeps the RTA's overall bond authorization at \$500,000,000. 1980 interim financing notes maybe sold either upon competitive bid or by a negotiated sale as determined by the RTA Board. The State Treasurer is further under this Act

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

granted the authority with the approval of the Governor to invest state funds which are not needed for current expenditures in the 1980 interim financing notes. This Conference Committee report defers the first repayment the state loaned by the RTA from July 1, 1980 and it would defer it to July 1 of 1981. And this would represent a savings of 6.9 millions of dollars to the RTA in fiscal year '81. Beginning July 1, 1980, and each July thereafter, until the loan is totally repaid without interest, the RTA is to pay the state 20% of the amount of the loan, which amounts to 30.6 millions of dollars. The RTA's current fiscal year is extended from June 30, 1980 to September 30 of 1980. Also beginning on October 1st of 1980, the authority's fiscal year is to begin October 1st and would end on September 30th. Presently the RTA is mandated to adopt a balanced annual budget prior to the beginning of each fiscal year. This provision is altered to require the adoption of an annual budget within the first quarter of each fiscal year. It would also require the RTA Board to hold a meeting with each County Board in the RTA region prior to the adoption of each annual budget. The RTA Act is also amended with respect to appointments to the metropolitan area transportation council. Presently, suburban appointees to the council must be an elected local official. This language is stricken to allow the appointment of any individual. And language is also added to this Section to encourage timely appointments by all appointing authorities. In the event that appointments have not been made, the RTA is

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

to notify the responsible appointing authority. If the appointment still has not been made 30 days after RTA notification, the RTA is to cut off funding used to provide services in the county or city represented by the negligent appointing authority or until the appointments are made. It would also amend the Vehicle Code to allow any local mass transit District and carriers under the jurisdiction of the RTA to be self-insured. And therefore, you'd be eliminating the cost of purchasing insurance. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "You seemed to indicate the impact or the effect of concurrence in Senate Amendments 3 and 5 and the further Amendments that were added to the Bill. Is there anything left of the underlining Bill? Or have you covered that?"

Garnisa: "That... All these points that I've mentioned is the Bill, Representative."

Brummer: "Well, the analysis indicates those are further Amendments. I was wondering if there was anything left of the original Bill and if so, what the original Bill provided or that portion that was still left?"

Garnisa: "There are some further inclusions of that, I'm sorry, whereby corporate trustee would be appointed that could receive the state funding and he would be the disbursing officer."

Brummer: "Okay, with regard to the state loan through the RTA, as I understand that, any repayment is deferred for another year on that....."

Garnisa: "We're making reference to the 34.6 millions of

dollars that the RTA owes to the state and they will be repaid one year late at..over a five year period."

Brummer: "Okay. Could you refresh my recollection of when that money was... when that loan first became due to the state? It seems to me we previously deferred that, have we not in some prior action, prior years?"

Garnisa: "Your memory is serving you correctly."

Brummer: "When was that first due to the state?"

Garnisa: "I believe it was last year at this date or the year before. I'm not quite sure on that point."

Brummer: "If I recall correctly, part of the transportation package that was put together last year was that this 34.6 million dollars or at least some portion of it would be paid this July 1st."

Garnisa: "That is correct."

Brummer: "Was that proposal that the entire 34.6 million be paid this July 1st or did that provide for installment?"

Garnisa: "Under this.. Under this current Bill, we're asking for a year's delay and then to pay that a year from now at the rate of...percent per year."

Brummer: "Right, I understand that. Now, my question was, what was the.. How much was due last ... under the transportation package that was put together last year, how much was to be paid July 1st, 1980?"

Garnisa: "Six point nine millions of dollars."

Brummer: "Okay, with regard to the authorization of the State Treasurer being granted authority with the approval of the Governor to invest state funds in the interim financing notes, do you have any indication from either the Treasurer or the Governor that that

will be done?"

Garmisa: "The..Under this Bill, it would call for the State Treasurer to be able to purchase these funds.. or these bonds at tax anticipation warrants with the approval of the Governor."

Brunner: "Okay. We currently have 34.6 million dollars owed from the RTA to the State of Illinois. And that has been owed for some period of time and it has been periodically deferred and payments have not been made. It would appear to me that now what we're doing is authorizing the State of Illinois to lend additional dollars to the RTA and we may have the follow up question occurring again in subsequent months or years that we defer the payment on that for an additional six months or one year or five years or eventually result in some total forgiveness. Do you have any indication that the money that the state would invest or in 1980 interim financing notes would ever be repaid?"

Garmisa: "These monies will be secured by the tax dollars that are due to the RTA. And also by the federal funding due to the RTA. We can use both sources of funds in order to repay this debt."

Brunner: "Originally when the 34.6 million dollars was due to the State of Illinois from the RTA, was that secured?"

Garmisa: "Not that I know of. That was really an original loan to the CTA. The RTA did not borrow that money."

Brunner: "One final question. What is the significance of extending the fiscal year from June 30th to September 30th?"

Garmisa: "Because on June 30th, whenever the General Assembly comes up with the monies that are to be provided by the General Assembly to the RTA, they really do not have any time to formulate a budget that would make any sense and when we give them this extra couple of months in order to come up with a type of budget that we would be financing. They, right now, would be working in the dark up until June 30th at which time they would know what funding would be available to them. And this extra time is needed so that they can formulate a budget that would make sense."

Brummer: "And there's nothing in here about half fare reimbursements for students or senior citizens?"

Garmisa: "We have no half fare reimbursements for the elderly or for the students in this package."

Brummer: "In this Bill or in any other Conference Committee report..."

Garmisa: "In no other Bill, nor in no other Conference Committee report that I know of."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Davis: "Representative Garmisa, in this Conference Committee report is there an Amendment that would affect nonurbanized areas of the RTA region to allow them to apply for Title 18 funding or Section 18 funding?"

Garmisa: "No, there is not."

Davis: "Another question, Representative Garmisa. I think I heard you say just a moment ago to Representative

Brummer, there is no subsidy for half fare or elderly...half fare students for elderly and students in this Bill?"

Garmisa: "No, there is not."

Davis: "One more question, Sir. It is my understanding that the Treasurer of this state and the Governor in conjunction one to the other can loan tax anticipation notes to organizations like the RTA without benefit of legislative authority. Is that true?"

Garmisa: "That is correct. I believe there's been some precedent established for just that"

Davis: "I believe the Chicago Board of Education was that precedent."

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Davis: "Well, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. That being the case, I'd just like to say a few things before I hit the last point. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there was a group of Legislators on this side and the other side of the aisle who reside in the RTA region who have opposed consistently RTA rip-offs in the past. That group of Legislators is trying very hard to work with mass transit which we see as the dominant and coming force in the metropolitan areas as an alternative to two and three and four dollar a gallon gasoline. There were agreements made to put on certain Amendments in the House or in the Senate that would address themselves to some relief for some of the nonurbanized areas of the RTA region. That agreement was violated. In exchange for some votes on half fare and student subsidies from the state to the RTA region, which we're interested in because those of

us who live in that region think that the state should return to a total commitment of subsidy to mass transit rather than a sales tax base locally. We provided some votes that would get working cash fund, the hundred million dollar working bond cash fund Bill, out of this House. The immediate effect of that was to have the RTA stop by Board Resolution all hearings about a possibility of a fair increase in the RTA region, another violation I believe of an agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the Governor of this State and if the Treasurer of this State can loan working cash loans from the State Treasury to the Regional Transportation Authority, without this legislation, without this authority, it only occurs to me that why should we give them this authority by legislation when they can do it by executive direction in cooperation one to the other? It is time, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this House and the Senate begin to recognize that the automobile is going by the way of the dodo bird. It's going to be an anachronism in even the small towns and villages of this state who are going to be crying out for mini-bus service, taxi cab service, maybe even street car service before it's all over. Now, we'd better start examining the idea of alternate funding to take away an onerous increase in the sales tax that occurred to 70% of the people in the state last year and return to state subsidy to mass transportation throughout the State of Illinois. This Bill and Conference Committee report are not needed by the Sponsor's own admission. The Governor and the

Treasurer of this state can authorize these loans to ease the working cash problems of the RTA without us. I encourage you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Winchester: "Is ... I believe it is House Bill 3490 was a previous Bill that you sponsored. In that, was the downstate rural mass transit? And in 3490, we're going to take a half a million dollars away from the downstate mass transit program, rural downstate mass transit, transport into the RTA. Is that part of this Bill?"

Garnisa: "No, it is not."

Winchester: "And, I think this question was asked once before, but I'm not sure. Where is 3236, 3237, the student and elderly monies, half fare monies?"

Garnisa: "Where is their money?"

Winchester: "Well, I'm sorry. You had those two Bills. Is any of that language incorporated into this Conference Committee report for the students and elderly half fares?"

Garnisa: "I've already answered that question..."

Winchester: "Well, I...."

Garnisa: "...In the negative."

Winchester: "Thank you. I wasn't sure if you had or not. It was kind of noisy back here, in the back, Sparky. Well, I want to stand in opposition, Mr. Speaker, because I don't really know all that's in this piece of legislation. It's kind of technical and I'm always a little leery of these last minute deals and programs

that take place. Rumors are flying rampant throughout the House of Representatives that some kind of deal has been cut for downstate to lose money on education and this maybe the Bill to do it with. And if that's the case, I've noticed in print-outs that's circulating around the floor that my Legislative District is only going to get about a two percent increase. Other Legislative Districts are going to get even less than that. And if that's the case, then I think that we should hold up on this Bill. We should maybe send it back to a second Conference Committee and hold it until we find out what's going to happen on education. This may be our only chance for those of you in downstate to preserve what you need for your School Districts. Be careful."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question? Representative Garmisa, the Senate Amendment 4 I think restricted ability of the RTA to use the working cash fund bonds to acquire capital equipment and I would imagine thereby to acquire the Rock Island Railroad if they so chose. Does the language of the Conference Committee report restore the restriction on the use of working cash fund or now these interim financing notes for capital acquisition?"

Garmisa: "Representative Bowman, if you will make reference to page ten.."

Bowman: "Alright.."

Garmisa: "..Of the Bill, starting on...It's actually...I'm sorry. It starts on page nine line 22 where we explain that the financing notes may be used to pay day to day

operating expenses of the authority consisting of wages, salaries and fringe benefits, professional and technical services including legal, audit, engineering and other consulting services, office rental furniture, fixtures and equipment, insurance premiums, claims for self-insured amounts under insurance policies, public utility obligations for telephone, light, heat and similar items. Also it would pay for travel expenses, office supplies, posters, dues, subscriptions, public hearings, and information expenses. Fuel purchases and also for payments of grants and payments under purchase of service agreements for operations of transportation agencies prior to the receipt by the authority from time to time of funds for paying such expenses. And the proceeds of the 1980 interim financing notes shall not be used to increase or provide a debt services reserve fund for any bonds or notes other than 1980 interim financing notes. Or to pay for principal of or interest or redemption premiums on any capital bonds or notes whether as such amounts become to or by earlier redemption issued prior to the date of this amendatory Act of 1980 by a transportation agency to construct or acquire public transportation facilities or to provide funds to purchase such capital bonds or notes."

Bowman: "Thank you, Representative Garaisa. I did not want people to be misled by the first item under the Conference report that recommends the Senate recede from Amendment 4 because I think that language which you just read which was an Amendment, Senate Amendment

#4, has been added back in later on in the Conference Committee report. I want everyone here to understand that the language of the Conference Committee report is pretty tight with respect to the restrictions placed on the working cash fund or actually interim financing note arrangement that the interim financing notes will not be able to be used for capital acquisition. I'm glad that you brought that to the House's attention. I would like to.. in speaking in favor of this Conference Committee report, because I did vote against the motion to concur in the Senate Amendments, and I have been voting against this Bill all along, I want to say now that I'm quite pleased to see that the interim financing note borrowings under that arrangement will have to be paid back within a year. The Bill in its original form is completely open-ended, would have allowed the borrowing to simply be used for current operations without any repayment requirements. Now, that that has been tightened up, I think it's a much better piece of legislation. I'm happy to support it."

Garmisa: "You're a very observant Legislator, Representative Bowman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson. Vinson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Vinson: "As I understood what you said, Representative Garmisa, about the Bill I understood there's a loan in here for the RTA from the state potentially of up to 75 million dollars. Is that correct?"

Garnisa: "That is correct. The speaker before you sometime, Representative Vinson, had mentioned the loan being one hundred million dollars. That was in error. It has been reduced to 75 millions of dollars."

Vinson: "And, is it specified what fund that money can come out of?"

Garnisa: "That would be funds that would not be needed for current state expenditures."

Vinson: "Is there any provision in the Bill for a similar loan or grant for downstate roads?"

Garnisa: "This Bill does not deal with downstate roads in any respect."

Vinson: "So, it's just an RTA loan Bill?"

Garnisa: "That is correct."

Vinson: "Well, to the Bill then, Mr. Speaker. I would urge that, downstaters particularly, look very closely at this Bill. I think it bears rejection. This Bill is another RTA rip-off in which, in this case, downstate would get nothing. This Bill gives up any lever we would have on achieving anything for downstate roads or for any other project of interest to downstate. But I think it would be a drastic mistake for us to give up this lever just as a matter of negotiating until we're assured that we're going to get something. If we can't get something in the way of tax reform, school aid, etc., there's no reason for us to support this Bill. Downstaters definitely ought to be voting 'no' on it. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen. Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous

question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Garmisa to close."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there have been some comments made here during this debate in regards to the need for help in the downstate areas. This Bill deals directly with a situation that is very critical in the six northeast counties and that's what this Bill is addressing itself to. The General Assembly, whatever problems they have in their areas, their parochial problems, whenever they come up you shall, as far as this Legislator is concerned, find himself sympathetic with your problems as they occur. And, the fact that you may have some problems, that does not affect this Bill, should not in any way influence an 'aye' vote on this Bill. This Bill is sorely needed. We have to...Somebody also mentioned about the automobile going the way of the dodo bird. Well, let me tell you, if we don't we have mass transportation in that six county area, he's going to be absolutely speaking the truth. The automobile will go the way of the dodo bird because all of those highways we have up there will be just great big giant parking lots. Mass transportation is sorely needed in that part of the state and this is a very critical issue at this time. The funding is short. We need this extra....We're not talking about borrowing money. We're talking about the selling of tax anticipation warrants or short term notes. I beg the indulgence of every Member of this

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

General Assembly in supporting this fine piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the First Conference Committee report on House Bill 3160. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Conti to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the Sponsor of this Bill that mass transportation is the answer and we'd better address ourselves to that problem of mass transportation. When I was a strong advocate of the RTA, I explained that I hoped that the RTA region someday will have a complete abolition of the CTA. But each and every year that we come in here with these Bills, we find that we're loosening the RTA and we're strengthening the CTA. For example, the effect of Senate Amendment #3 provides that whenever a vacancy on the RTA Board exists for longer than four months, a new Director shall be chosen by election of all Legislative Members in the General Assembly representing the affected area, except, except those Directors by the Mayor of the city of Chicago. Now, in the working cash may be used for salaries and fringe benefits. The city of Chicago I think in their wage contracts has a cost of living every six months in there. A hundred million dollars wouldn't go anyplace if you're going to use a working cash fund for fringe benefits and travel expenses along in the same program. It exempts the selling of the notes from public advertising. Why? It eliminates the requirements that collar county

Members of the city council must be selected officials located in the county from which he or she is appointed or must be a Member of the local mass transit. This loosens the requirements for Membership so that the Member may only be a citizen. The restriction does not apply to Members of the city of Chicago. But now, we can appoint citizens from the suburban collar area but not in the city of Chicago again. Again strengthening the CTA. With these provisions weakening the RTA in the RTA region, this strong advocate of the RTA is soon going to become an opponent of the RTA. I urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, why is it that mass transportation must be the butt of all arguments and all antagonisms within the state? Surely it is an absolute, fundamental necessity just as much as the roads for downstate are. We do not turn a deaf ear to you. We help with all programs that are possible. But here again, you have a situation where the national, literally, the national defense, the economy of the city of Chicago, all of these things are interconnected, belong and deserve to be supported simply because they are connected to the RTA. Now, I say to you, that we in the city of Chicago need mass transportation. It is an absolute necessity. For you to deny us this would be the same for us to slice in half every major highway in the state. It is immoral, unethical, and certainly not considerate for you to sit on one of the primary interests simply because it comes from the city of Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my vote, this Bill does not constitute a new state loan to RTA. It does not constitute a new state subsidy to RTA. It does not grant any additional following authority to RTA. What it does, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is to allow RTA to use some of its present bonding authority for the purpose of getting over a hump, a hump that has been inflicted upon the RTA by a delay in payments to it from both the Federal Government and the State Government. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, at the out set I have been critical of RTA. I am still critical of RTA in terms of enabling legislation. But I don't think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that at this time it's appropriate to get into the substantive merits or lack of merits with respect to RTA. I think we've got to accept what presently exists on June 30th, 1980 and give an 'aye' vote to this Bill to allow RTA to get through the remainder of this Calendar year. I am satisfied, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that these notes, one hundred million dollars worth, can be paid off and will be paid off by the end of this year without any burden on the state, without any burden on the taxpayers of the state. And I, for one, will be voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #2 has been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, one minute to explain his vote."

Deuster: "In urging more 'no' votes, one of the crazy

provisions in this Bill is that the funding will be cut off for anybody in Lake, McHenry, DuPage, Kane, Will and also Cook in the city of Chicago if for some reason they don't make their appointments to this inconsequential group called the metropolitan area transportation council. I think it's ridiculous. That council doesn't amount to much other than a sounding board as far as I know and to cut off funding for transportation, for mass transportation, simply because there might be some delay in appointing a Member to this council is wrong. They ought to go back to the drawing board and strike this out of the Bill. That's just one more reason to vote 'no' and I encourage many more 'no' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce?"

Pierce: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's about time that we face up to the fact that the Regional Transportation Authority is here to stay whether we approved of its creation or not. It's here to stay. Public transportation, mass transportation, is going to be in our future, our children's future and our grandchildren's future. The only way that we can obtain any federal funding or any other help is have a regional agency to coordinate our transportation and our public transportation in the metropolitan area. Now, RTA is here to stay. The gasoline prices are on their way to \$2.00 a gallon. Automobiles are going to be less and less available for use to go to and from work. Public transportation will be more and more necessary. The Bill that the Gentleman from Cook presents, House Bill 3160, helps

keep the RTA operating. Helps keep the existing transportation system, the six commuter railroad lines, the suburban bus lines they're putting in Waukegan and North Chicago, in my county in Highland Park, in Libertyville and other places. The CTA in Chicago that runs not only in Chicago, but also in Evanston, Willmette, Oak Park, Cicero, Berwyn, Forest Park, and other communities...the CTA is not confined solely to the city of Chicago. It is important that we keep the RTA operating, that we keep public transportation operating. This Bill is a rational attempt, a rational attempt, to keep the RTA operating at reasonable fares. We had a 20% fare increase just last summer. The fares in Chicago went from 50 to 60%. That's a 20% increase. The fares on the Northwestern line went up 17 or 18%. That was less than a year ago. We've had the fare increase. We took away, we took away the state subsidy. We took away the gasoline tax. The sales tax is not producing the revenue that the so-called experts said it would. This package of Bills is a rational meaningful way of keeping public transportation viable in the metropolitan area. I support it and I come from a collar county and I'm willing to go back to my constituents and say we need public transportation. We need good schools. We need to clean up Lake Michigan and we need a way to get to and from Chicago for the people to work. And that's what the RTA does. The Milwaukee Road is bankrupt. The Rock Island Road is bankrupt. Only the RTA keeps public transportation going. It's up to us in the General Assembly to

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

fulfill our responsibilities and pass this package of Bills. And as a collar county Legislator, I'm proud to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do hope that Members are paying attention and realize what they're voting for or against on this. Last year we had the big transportation fiasco down here. The one big thing was that all we needed to do was give this to them and they'd be able to pay back this loan. It was the cure all. Well, the one thing in here right now, now they're deferring another payment on the loan for another year. Interest free loans, our State Treasurer is continually talking about how he's investing the funds and making so much money for the state on the way he is investing funds, but here we're going one more time giving them another year, interest free loan. Second thing, I don't know if you realize it or not, but in here they changed their annual reporting date for their budget. Well, it sounds good on the surface. They want to stay the same as the Federal Government. But the problem is, we're talking about August 1st. Right now, it comes in on February 1st and we, at the General Assembly, can sit there and scrutinize it because we're in Session. August 1st we're not in Session. So fine, the RTA can go ahead, push through their boondoggle budget and we're not here in Session to look at it whatsoever. I think the one thing that we've got to realize is this is another thing by the RTA, hitting it to the suburbs, the collar counties, and the

downstate people. The state right now has the lending authority. They don't need this Bill for the lending authority. The state already has it and I don't think you need a Bill to say that we're going to give them 75 million dollars or 75 thousand dollars or whatever this figure they want to come up with year after year. And so I would ask for a 'no' vote on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dyne."

Van Dyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative...Am I on?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dyne."

Van Dyne: "All right. I'm with you. But, Representative Pierce said, I forgot what he said. But Schlickman said the same thing. All I'm saying to you, Representatives in the House is this, that all we want in the..and it's been so long since I've put my light on, I even forgot what I've written down. But all we want.. All we want is some kind of equity. And this comes from existing funds which only exacerbate the philosophy that we're going to get some kind of break in the collar counties. And please, think about what you're doing. We're only doing this... We're doing more damage to the collar county than what they're already done already."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, because I hope to have a potential conflict of interest, I'm going to vote 'present' on this, but I've heard an awful lot of sounds in fury which has very little relevance to the merits of the issue. I frankly think that we could have done a lot

worse. Now, the basic..the basic thrust of the opposition argument seems to be that they were left out of the cutting of the deal. And there's certainly no doubt about that. Virtually everyone who's spoken against it had nothing to say with the content of the Conference Committee report. I still don't see how they could have done much better if they had had a say."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This proposal and the total financing package for the RTA now makes the Chicago School District financial crisis look like small potatoes. We are fast on our way to creating a more gigantic financial crisis in mass transportation by using the Chicago shell game to fund these programs, like we're asked to do in this proposal. I suggest to the Members of the General Assembly that we take this Conference Committee and put it in the subway and wait till.. and wait till this Committee....I had a better suggestion for the Conference Committee report, but, we take this.. We take this Conference Committee report and return it to whence it came and look for some more sound financing proposals that this state can afford. If we continue to embark on this complete state reliance for mass transportation, you may be able to fund the RTA, but pretty soon there's going to be no resources left in the state to do anything else. And that's the danger that we're embarking on right now by this shell game."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, for quite some years now I have come down here and watched what has now become habitual, a rip-off by the Representatives of Chicago and I don't blame them, but a rip-off for the people from downstate. Any person from downstate, any Representative from downstate that doesn't resent it by this time and see that this is going to continue maybe forever, have lost their minds. I think at least we should have enough sense anyone downstate, and Representatives downstate should vote 'no'. And try to stop it, although we probably can't. At least we should try."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Representative Steele, please sit down."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Steele? Please sit down. Neff.."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I would only appeal to the two Lake County Legislators who are supporting the motion here today to accept this Conference Committee report. If for no other reason this should be denied and sent back to Conference Committee. The people that were on this particular Conference Committee were taking a direct slap at Lake County. As you both know, we have been trying to replace our Representative on that Board for some time. There has been some difficulties in replacing this individual. But if we go along with the Conference Committee report, this will be taken away from Lake County and this will be most unfortunate. I'm sure that both John and Dan appreciate the fact that as the third largest county

in this state, we have an absolute right to have direct representation on that Board and the Legislature should not get involved with its statewide politics in determining who should be the Member of that Board. I would suggest that we vote 'no' on this just to get it back into the Second Conference Committee to eliminate this unnecessary Amendment to this particular Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85 'aye' and 65 'no'. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa requests a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Dave Jones. Kane. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Williams. J.J. Wolf. And, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "How am I recorded Mr. Speaker?"

McAuliffe: "How is Representative McAuliffe recorded?"

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

McAuliffe: "Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Representative Ebbesen?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you vote me 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "If this should get the 89 votes, I'd like a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J.J. Wolf, 'aye'. Anything further? Representative Woodyard. Woodyard, 'aye'."

Representative Birchler?"

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

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded..."

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Birchler: "Change my 'present' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'.
Representative Stearney? Stearney desires to be
recorded as 'aye'. Representative Ropp.
Representative Ropp desires to be recorded as 'aye'.
Representative Bradley? Rea."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Rea recorded?"

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

Rea: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Anything
further? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this
question there's 93 'aye' and 62 'no'. Representative
Vinson? I heard that. Anyone else, before we declare
the results, desire to be on this Roll Call. 93 'aye'
and 62 'no'. Representative Vinson has requested a
verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Everybody
be in your seat. Please be in your seat. Proceed,
Mr. Clerk. Representative Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Schraeder as 'no'.
Representative Walsh will you please sit down?
Representative Schoeberlein. That little short Vinson
can't see over you. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, leave to be verified. I have to take a Conference Committee report over to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Pierce be verified? Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey. Catania. Chapman. Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McClain. McCourt. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reilly. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Schneider. Sharp. Slape. Stearney. Steczo. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Walsh. White. Willer. Williamson. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Parliamentarian come to the podium? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mrs. Balanoff?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Vinson: "Braun?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here in the green outfit."

Vinson: "Could we have a count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "It was 93."

Vinson: "Bullock?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Vinson: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Redmond: "Bullock? Is Representative Bullock on the phone.. on the floor? There he is, coming in the back."

Vinson: "Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Vinson: "Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, it would easier if the Members were in their seats."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I've told them three times. They're all bigger than I am. And you too."

Vinson: "Farley?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there."

Vinson: "Kucharski?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Kucharski recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Speaker Redmond: "What do you want me to do with him, Representative Vinson?"

Vinson: "Remove him."

Speaker Redmond: "From the not voting? Representative O'Brien requests leave to be verified. Is that all right? Kucharski isn't recorded."

Vinson: "Kulas? Kulas?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there, next to DiPrima."

Vinson: "Leinenweber."

Speaker Redmond: "Leinenweber?..."

Vinson: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "He's 'no'."

Vinson: "McClain? Mugalian?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mugalian here? How is Mugalian recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "He's not on the floor, is that correct?
Remove Representative Mugalian. Representative
Margalus desires to be verified."

Vinson: "Patrick?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is Patrick back there? He's there."

Vinson: "That wasn't Patrick that waved his hands, Mr.
Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "That's Patrick."

Vinson: "Reilly?"

Speaker Redmond: "Reilly? How's Reilly recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the back. Reilly's in the back
there coming down the middle aisle."

Vinson: "Schisler?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Schisler...He's in
the back there."

Vinson: "Sharp?"

Speaker Redmond: "Sharp's in his chair."

Vinson: "Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Slape? Slape here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Remove Representative Slape."

Vinson: "VonBoeckman?"

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

Vinson: "White?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Vinson: "I see him."

Speaker Redmond: "He's right there."

Vinson: "Younge?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge is back in her seat.

Slape has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call."

Vinson: "O'Brien?"

Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien requested permission to be verified earlier. He's in the middle aisle."

Vinson: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 92 'aye', 63 'no'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee report on House Bill 3160. On the Order of Concurrence on page two of the Regular Calendar appears House Bill 3066. Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3066...Request the appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House...John Dunn..nonconcur. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was under the impression that I was going to be informed on the decision on this particular Bill. The motion to nonconcur on two Amendments on 3066 applied to two particular districts who were..."

Dunn: "Let me take it out of the record for just a minute and let me get together with him."

Hoffman: "He wished to take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3067, Chapman...Take 3067 out of the record. House Bill 2955, Representative Giorgi...page two of the Regular Calendar."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2955 is the Chrysler Bill,

and, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2...1, 2, and 3 to 2955. Senate Amendment 1 by Representative Walsh made the Bill like it was originally in the House when we couldn't pass it. Senate Amendment 2 by Busby reinstated the Bill that left the House so it is in the same form as it left the House, and Senate Amendment 3 by Gitz asks that while the loan is outstanding, that 40% of the work force be kept working at all times in the State of Illinois, and I concur with all three Amendments. So I ask the House to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 2955."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Just a couple of questions of the Sponsor. Representative Giorgi, do I understand that the Bill in its current form is a direct loan to Chrysler? Is that right?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Sir."

Johnson: "Is the Bill in its current form... contain provisions requiring that Chrysler continue to locate its Belvidere plant here in the State of Illinois?"

Giorgi: "The Belvidere plant...some of the collateral is on the Belvidere plant as well as the proving grounds in Detroit and the Elk Grove parts depot."

Johnson: "My question is...we amended it.. there was a provision that would require Chrysler to continue to locate its business in the State of Illinois. I'm not talking about collateral now, I'll ask that in a minute. I am just talking... you remember, I think it was Amendment #8 or something. Skinner and I had

adopted it, and it was adopted, taken off in the Senate, that would require Chrysler to locate and continue to be located here in Illinois. I just wonder if that is still in the Bill."

Giorgi: "I don't know which part of the Bill you are in, Tim. an you give me the part of the Bill you're in?"

Johnson: "Wait just one second."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi.."

Johnson: "I believe..."

Giorgi: "...Johnson identify the part of the Bill he is in. Representative Johnson, to identify the part of the Bill he is asking the question on."

Johnson: "Do you recall the Amendment we adopted that would provide for penalties in the event that the work force was reduced by X amount...I don't remember the exact...I can't give you the exact language of the Amendment, but the purport of the Amendment was that in exchange for a direct loan or subsidy at the time...the guarantee at the time, that Chrysler would agree to keep its work force to a certain percentage what it is at the time that Bill was adopted. Representative Skinner can probably remember the exact number of the Amendment. If you'll give me one second, I can tell you the exact Amendment that was adopted in the House."

Giorgi: "To accommodate Representative Johnson, I'll pull it out of the record temporarily."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi..Giorgi."

Giorgi: "To accommodate Representative Johnson, I'll take it out of the record momentarily, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bill

3066. 3066, Representative John Dunn. Jon Dunn, 3066."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I will persist in my motion for nonconcurrency and the request for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this motion on nonconcurrency. We have worked many, many months to put this program together and include the money in it for the districts that are included in 3114, and we have general agreement of practically all of the parties who have an interest in this, and for that reason, I rise in opposition to this motion of nonconcurrency and request a Roll Call... a vote on this as I understand it. It requires a Simple Majority, and I would ask those people ...I would ask you to vote 'no' on this motion to nonconcur which we can follow with another motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur. If the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur were to be successful, and if there were a Conference Committee appointed to consider this particular issue, it could be pretty well determined right now what the results of the Conference Committee would be. The issue before us is funding level for elementary and secondary education. The Senate has spoken on this issue. The position of the Senate Democrats would be that the level of the School Problems Commission...in

a Conference Committee it could be expected that the Republican appointees to the Committee, which support either the School Problems Commission funding level or a level closer to the Governor's budget level. Therefore, immediately the numbers are not present to change or to raise any higher the current level that would be provided by a motion to concur. Any effort to go into a Conference Committee would simply unduly delay our deliberations tonight. It would not succeed in any increased funding for election, and for that reason, the Gentleman's motion ought to be defeated, and we ought to move along toward a final reconciliation of the issues before the Assembly at this time."

Speaker Redmond "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of the motion to nonconcur. As far as I know, we are a separate House from the Senate, and as far as I know we came to an agreement here to put a figure on this particular Bill with regard to educational funding in the public sector above that of the Senate. Now, the argument was made in the Senate, and it was a valid one at the time, that the action of Congress was to significantly cut revenue sharing money. That was true at the time. Last week, the Governor again urged that we reduce the money because we weren't going to get the revenue sharing that we have historically gotten that has been dedicated to this purpose. Friday evening, the great bulk of that revenue sharing was once again returned to the federal budget by actions in the Senate sponsored by Republicans and

Democrats alike in Washington. Now if we are going to stand up for what this House did and what the Democratic task force did that the Majority Leader put together, then we should vote with Representative Dunn and vote with our principles and put this Bill into a Conference Committee. I don't necessarily believe that the Majority Leader is right. In fact, I don't think he is at all in this particular case, and I am willing to take that chance. And I can recall three years ago when we got into this posture that certain people who voted to cut the budget weren't all Republicans. It is time that we stood up for the House of Representatives that we belong to and stop capitulating to the Senate that took our Bills over there and emasculated them to help themselves. And in fact, one Member of that Body had the courage to gut one of the Bills, take out \$28,000,000 by one Amendment, and turn around and put in \$800,000 for his own district. That seems to be inconsistent, and I think it would be inconsistent for us to capitulate at this point to the Majority Leader or those people who would want to cut educational funding. And I rise on a principle as a Democrat to urge the Democrats who are a party to putting this Bill in the Senate and part of the task force to vote to nonconcur."

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

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It has been said that we should let this Bill go back. Well, the Senate has spoken. The House hasn't spoken yet on this Bill. The House should

speak loud and clear on this Bill. There are several of us downstate who are not getting a fair share of the pie. For the school funding, we know we're not getting a fair share of the pie, and if we can't get a fair share, I think we should do just like the Sponsor of this Bill, Mr. Dunn, has spoken. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, move the previous question please."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There is a very basic reason why this motion for nonconcurrency has been filed. We're dealing with the elementary and secondary school appropriations for the entire State of Illinois. At the present time, the level of that appropriation has essentially been set by the Governor and by the School Problems Commission. And while I am sure they have the best of intentions, there are a number of us, particularly downstate, all over downstate, who feel that our share of the pie is not as large as it should be this year. We feel that there is more money that can be put into education. We feel that if pressure is applied, if we get into Conference Committee, we can negotiate for more and better funding for downstate Illinois and all of Illinois, for Chicago as well. A previous speaker has indicated we should not put this Bill in Conference Committee. We should put

it in Conference Committee for all the people of the State of Illinois so that we can proceed to get a fair and equitable share of general revenue dollars for education in the State of Illinois. As you all know, we have a constitutional mandate for the State of Illinois to provide greater than 50% of the cost of educating our children. Instead of doing that, we are moving to a smaller and smaller fraction of that cost. Local taxpayers are picking up more and more of the burden. Do you want to go home and tell your people back home that the homeowners are paying more in the State of Illinois this year than they did last year, that the homeowners are picking up a greater share of the burden? If you think the homeowners are being ripped off, then vote for this motion, get this Bill into Conference Committee, and let's thrash out this issue. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur..is that the motion, Representative Dunn? Nonconcur, is that correct?"

Dunn: "The motion is to nonconcur, Mr. Speaker and I recommend a green light."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's motion is to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 3066. 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 35 'ayes', 115 'no', and the motion fails. Representative Dunn."

Dunn,J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, resisting tremendous pressure to table the Bill, I now move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3066. Those in favor vote 'aye'...wait a minute now. The House is faster than the computer. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, does this Roll Call apply to one Amendment or two Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Amendments #1 and 2."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendments 1 and 2. Representative Slape...Representative Slape desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye', and 12 'no'. And the motion prevails. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3066. The Members have joined the Body before..since we took that Roll Call, so we'll have a Roll call for attendance. Have all voted who wish? Totten, don't you want to be paid? Sometimes there's a consensus that maybe you weren't. House will...take the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3067, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3067 represents not only the Bill as introduced in the House, but also represents much of the contents of House Bill 3065 of ..which was defeated on the floor of this House earlier this year and was amended into House Bill 3067 over in the Senate. The Bill totals \$389,524,000 at this time and I'm happy to remind you includes 100% funding for all formula driven programs."

One hundred percent funding, we are keeping faith as many of us have pledged we would do to the citizens in our districts. And, so the formula driven programs have a sufficient amount we believe, so that the funding will total 100% of the needs. I ask for your support of House Bill 3067."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is it? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "One of the formula driven programs which has consistently been ..has been underfunded by this General Assembly has been the school bus transportation program. Is that in this Bill? And is it fully funded?"

Chapman: "Yes, Sir."

Skinner: "Fully funded? One hundred percent?"

Chapman: "That's right, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I shall collapse in awe. Maybe I shouldn't even ask about bilingual education. Maybe I should quit while I'm ahead. Do you have.."

Chapman: "Just feel free, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Is bilingual education in this?"

Chapman: "Yes."

Skinner: "Why?"

Chapman: "Bilingual education, as you know, Mr. Skinner, is required. It is not a formula driven mandate such as transportation or special education. But it is required and I believe the time has come in this Session where we need to see that the needs of our local schools are met. The time is now and the vote is 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Skinner: "Well, Representative, I appreciate your putting in

100% funding for public school busing for public school students. I think that's quite appropriate given the private school busing Bill that's before us. But I do wonder why you added bilingual education which is not required by state law. It would seem to me that you should let it rise or fall as it has on several occasions previously under its own weight."

Chapman: "Mr. Skinner, may I remind you that what is being presented to you is the action which the Senate in its wisdom has taken. I do concur with their action, but this was not something which I added or we added in the House. This is the action of the Senate and it's been suggested that for your green light I should sayWhat is it, Mr. Cullerton, I'm supposed to say? Well..."

Skinner: "Mr. Cullerton says all sorts of weird things. Thank you very much."

Chapman: "I don't even know one word in Spanish. So you see, I could have used bilingual..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Griesheimer: "Representative Chapman, would you give us the figures that were inserted for bilingual education in this Bill in Conference Committee? And further indicate to us whether they have used the increased figure that was suggested in the original Bill that was defeated in this House earlier this year?"

Chapman: "To begin with, Mr. Stuffle (sic), there was no Conference Committee on this Bill...."

Griesheimer: "Attention (German), attention. Stuffle sounds like Griesheimer. But no, Stuffle is not asking the question. Griesheimer is."

Chapman: "Were you asking the question to Mr. Griesheimer, Mr. Stuffle? Love to have him answer..."

Griesheimer: "Yeah, Mr. Stuffle was asking..."

Chapman: "I don't know the language very well. What language it is, I'm not sure. I'm always suspicious when I hear language I don't understand."

Speaker Redmond: "..Representative Griesheimer?"

Griesheimer: "I'm just waiting for the answer to my question. Maybe Mr. Stuffle can answer the question. I'm sorry."

Chapman: "I was trying to answer Mr. Stuffle's question a little earlier."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Griesheimer was recognized."

Chapman: "Okay. There was... Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stuffle asked a question..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't know how Mr. Stuffle gets into the act because I recognized Representative Griesheimer. And he has..."

Chapman: "Beg your pardon. I saw Mr. Stuffle standing. I thought it was him..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he doesn't always stand."

Chapman: "Okay. Mr. Griesheimer, there was no Conference Committee report. This is a Senate action which has come back to us and my motion is to concur. The amount for bilingual Chicago is 13...13 million, 125 thousand, downstate 4 million, 375 thousand. This represents a decrease for the Chicago figure from the House action, the Bill that the Appropriations

Committee sent to the House floor and represents a slight increase for downstate."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll get my information from Mr. Carey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Chapman's motion, I think, should be supported. She may be surprised by my rising to make that statement. Many of us don't agree that the bilingual line should be as high as they are. But they have been cut significantly from where the State Board would have put them, in fact, cut nearly three million dollars in the city of Chicago and slightly less than two downstate for bilingual. I think we can live with that. Representative Skinner's point is well taken. For once, we are funding fully the transportation line items. We are funding fully the personnel line item for special education. And for downstaters, those are the most important lines in the entire budget other than the formulas. There are some other changes that probably everyone does not agree with, but I think on balance, we've got as much in this particular Bill as we could possibly hope to get. The Governor has given a commitment I understand to at least support full funding of the formula driven mandates. This Bill does that and for those reasons, should receivethis motion should receive an 'aye' vote from Members of both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dyne."

Van Dyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to get my lip back, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "No, that's a little previous (sic).
Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and particularly Representative Skinner, I think we need simply to explain to the Body for those who are not familiar with the formulas for reimbursement that while this Bill will provide 100% of the claims for transportation, it does not indeed cover the full cost of transportation. The formula as it is written allows the School Districts to claim only 80% and that 80% would be for the first time in a number of years be fully funded under this level. I support the motion to concur. But I think we do need to set that record straight. That's 100% of the claim; it's not the same as 100% of the cost."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, Representative Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Chapman to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, only to say that I would move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 (sic), 4, 5 and 6."

Speaker Redmond: "Is it 1, 2 or 1, 3?"

Chapman: "1,3,4,5 and 6 I believe. I wish to concur with all of the Amendments. And I believe the ones we have before us are 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 3067. Those in favor vote 'aye',

opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 22 'no'. And the House.... The motion carried and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 3067. 3068. 3068. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There's a letter I think that indicates that in the absence of Representative Hanahan that I am the Sponsor. What this Bill is, 3068, is the OCEE operating expenses for the State Board of Education. The Senate appropriation reduced 179,500 in the GRF request for operations. They had an Amendment, #2, offered an appropriation which transferred two positions and support costs for the gifted program from the Department of Specialized Ed Services to the Department of Federal And State Grants and makes..has no dollar impact. And the third Amendment also offered in the Senate makes a net reduction of 489,962 dollars in the State Board of Education federal funded FY '81 operations budget. And I move that we concur on Amendments 1, 2 and 3 from the Senate."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really don't have any question or any objection to Representative Schneider acting in Representative Hanahan instead, but I would question as to why Representative Hanahan was listed as voting 'yes' on the previous Bill that was up and I would also assume that he will not be voting 'yes' or 'no' on any of the rest of them."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on Representative Schneider's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 5 to House Bill 3114 (sic). Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. 3068, pardon me. Let's back up on that. It's concurrence on Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3068. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 1 'no'. And the House does concur in House...Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3068. 3114. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, there's a whole lot of people that have been asking me when the Cullerton show is going to begin. And, I've been told it'll be a couple of hours yet. Around 7:00 o'clock. We don't want to disturb the work of the House and I hear there may be a lull around 7:00 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "3114. 4:00 o'clock we had it scheduled, but he wasn't here. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 3114 is the substantive Bill...substantive Bill that relates to the 3066 that just went out. There are three Senate Amendments, 1, 2 and 5. It's my intention to ask the Membership to concur on those three Amendments. Amendment #1 deals with a unique problem in the School District of 'Galatia', which had a dramatic increase after their levy in the assessed valuation. What we are trying to do is to protect them for one year, a hold harmless provision, so that they will not suffer dramatic state aide and that I think will be helpful and therefore, I concur on

Amendment #1. Amendment #2 is 'Mascoota', which has Scott Air Force Base located within the confines of that School District. They will be experiencing in that district a loss of federal dollars and because of our changes in the formula, will be impacted negatively as a consequence of our changes in the Strayer-Haig. We are also protecting them one year so that their tax levy can be increased to meet their needs of that district and I would concur on that particular Amendment. And Amendment #5 brings the dollar amounts on the guaranteed assessed valuation into conformity with Representative Dunn's Bill, which we passed out of the House to bring the total per pupil from 1363 to 1463 this year in the school aide. I would ask therefore that the Members do concur in Amendments 1, 2 and 5 in the Senate."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As Chairman of the School Problems Commission, I just want to rise and take the position that..that I endorse, are the changes which were made in the Senate and urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any further discussion? The question is on the Representative Schneider's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 5 to House Bill 3114. 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 165 'aye' and 4 'no'. The motion carried. And the House concurs in Senate

Amendments 1, 2 and 5 to House Bill 3114. House Bill 2975 on page two. Representative Currie, on the Order of Concurrence."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2975. Senate Amendment #1 is the authorization...increased authorization for the Chicago School Finance Authority to increase the number of bonds outstanding from \$500 to \$573,000,000. We address...there is only one Amendment. We address this issue in the House when we look at Senate Bill 569 which is itself in the other chamber. The value of the additional authorization is that in the first place the Chicago School Finance Authority discovered that it needed...I'm sorry. I'm sorry, I move that we concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2975."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments...Representative Huff."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we do not concur with Senate (sic) Bill 2975 simply for the reason that the members that comprise the Chicago School Financial Authority..."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian."

Huff: "...Are business men from corporations many of which owe the schools millions of dollars in back taxes. I think that if they were really concerned about the quality of education, about the children in the schools, that they would seek first to pay their own indebtedness to that ...that Body. I think charity

begins at home, Mr. Speaker, and not in the General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. It was Senate Amendment...is Senate Amendment #2 germane to this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that it is germane."

Davis: "I'm sorry, that it is germane?"

Speaker Redmond: "It is germane. Yes."

Davis: "Well then, to the motion to concur. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you're listening, this is the authorization to increase the Chicago School Authority's bonding authority to \$572,000,000. As you know, the authorization to sell those bonds was in House Bill 569...or Senate Bill 569 the other day. Now if you don't like the idea of floating long term bonds for short term cash crisis, or you don't like the idea that the Chicago School Authority has backed off its mandate to...to lower the deficit position of the Chicago School Board, and if you don't like the idea that some of this money is going to be going to fund a continuing deficit in that organization, this will be your last chance, your absolute last chance, to vote to nonconcur or to defeat this motion and let the Sponsor then do what she will with the bill. It will probably go to a Conference Committee, and we'll have to be ready to then vote against that if that is the will of this General Assembly. I think it is a very bad idea. I don't think the Chicago School Authority, who I thought was going to be a very good

organization in between the citizens and the Chicago School Board, has really done...done its work well here. I don't think that we should allow increased bonding, and this Amendment is the authorization for that increase in bonds. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian has advised me that the correct procedure inasmuch as there was a motion by the Sponsor to concur and a motion by someone other than the Sponsor to nonconcur would be to take the Sponsor's motion first. I inquired as to the correct procedure, and that was his advice. So, Representative Currie, do you desire to close?"

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. No question we would prefer it if the Chicago School situation were not to borrow long term money for old debts. The fact is that the Chicago school system did go crash last year. The fact is that the money has already been allocated for...for responsibilities of the Chicago School Board incurred without actually having the wherewithal to meet it. The Chicago School Finance Authority is requiring substantial cuts by the Chicago Board of Education. The \$73,000,000 additional authorization contained in this Bill is only enough to keep them from making such drastic cuts that our children in our school system will be unable to have their educational needs met. The School Finance Authority is behaving very responsibly with respect to the Board. It is not willy-nilly giving them an additional \$73,000,000. The additional cost is necessary because of the market costs in the bond area and because the...the initial legislation did not

realize how expensive the actual borrowing of money would be. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2975."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2975. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Van Duyné to explain his vote."

Van Duyné: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I can't explain my vote. I wanted to ask you a parliamentary inquiry, and you just kept going. I presume that what we do now if we're not in favor of this is vote 'no', but what I wanted to know is what the position of Douglas Huff...Representative Doug Huff's motion was if and when this passed or failed or whatever, and I presume that I can answer my own question. If this passes, why he has no motion. Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I would assume that that would be correct."

Van Duyné: "Does he have any parliamentary..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I asked the Parliamentarian, and he advises me that the custom was to take the motion of the Sponsor first which is what I did. Now you've heard...Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would suggest that one commitment we ought to get from the Chicago School Board is that they will stop paying prevailing wages to union workers who are employed year round. We can cut substantial amounts of substantial millions of dollars from the budget if the School Board will have the guts to do that. If we keep bailing them out each year, and this is the

second year in a row for which they have been down here in a bail out position, they will never get down to the hard decisions that will have to be made to make the Chicago school system as efficient as some of the more efficient suburban systems. Voting 'yes' will just encourage waste."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Some of the Members here seem to think that this is a bail out Bill for the City of Chicago...for the school districts of Chicago, and I don't think this is a bail out Bill. What we are allowing Chicago to do is to get out of a financial crunch they have and to sell some \$73,000,000 more of bonds. Now these bonds will be paid for by the people of Chicago. Now one Gentleman a few minutes ago said, 'Well why doesn't Chicago raise the educational tax levy or taxes for...to take care of this?' But if they did that, the money wouldn't come in for another year. So I would hope that we get sufficient votes to pass this."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Again I want to rise to explain my vote on this issue which I have done before, and it's been very clear that what occurred over the course of the last few months is that the cost of money was so dramatic and fluctuated so wildly, mostly on the up side, that the money that we authorized, the \$500,000,000 in bonds, was not going to yield enough of the proceeds to meet

the needs of Chicago. Now I have no grief with the City of Chicago. I think they have made a good 'faith' effort in trying to reduce what some of the Members have referred to as waste in the system, and I am not going to carry their water, but it is pretty clear on the basis of the hearing that we've had up until now in the Chicago area on the issue that they are making that effort. So this money is partly needed, of course, to establish an appropriate amount of dollars to continue that effort at reforming the financial problems of the City of Chicago. Again, I also want to add that there are other items on their agenda that we denied as Members of the House because we felt that many of those issues can be dealt with at another time when we have adequate time for hearing and proper development of language. So I think this is an appropriate vote, a green vote, and I would encourage the Members to vote for this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Some of the people on the floor, I think, have assumed and said so privately that they think this is similar to another Bill earlier today that encumbered state money to pay off some of these bonds or a least to allow them to be marketed. It is not the case here. I think we ought to be helping the City of Chicago. It's been trying to do a good job, and as Representative Schneider indicated, this is not a bail out. It doesn't encumber us downstate or the state itself. It helps Chicago help itself so it doesn't come down here and ask us for the money. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...I would urge that before you vote red you consider what's happening. The supposed Chicago school bail out of \$500,000,000 was not a bail out at all. The \$500,000,000 is going to be paid and repaid through the local taxing effort. What happened was...is that Chicago public schools came to Springfield and did not ask for any state money. They asked for bonding money which they would pay off. They are doing this again with this \$73,000,000. Representative Schneider indicated the difficulties they had they...are borrowing...they had in the bond market and the monies that that cost last... when they floated the \$500,000,000 worth of bonds, and now what they want is the \$73,000,000 which represents some \$20,000,000 plus for operations and some \$40,000,000 for working cash fund. I want you before you vote 'no' to realize that this is an opportunity to have Chicago public schools again bail themselves out. If you don't give money and funds...if we don't authorize this bonding authority where Chicago can bail itself out, they're going to be looking for state funds. So it is a wise vote for those of you who are conscious and are interested in protecting the state treasury. If we could do this with every unit of local government that comes seeking funds...state funds, we would be a lot better off. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative William Walsh."

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

we've batted this thing around two or three times in the last week or so, and I suggest to you that what it means is that the Chicago School Finance Authority turns out to be a failure, and all of our efforts...a scant eight or nine months ago to create it were for naught because here they are back wanting more than the \$500,000,000 that we authorized them to issue in bonds because they feel that the...there were several things they...they felt that the cost of issuing bonds was more than they had anticipated, and I don't know what they anticipated, but it was more. Also the Chicago Board of Education abolished their working cash fund, and here we are reinstating it for the Chicago School Finance Authority. Now for those of you that say that the City gets absolutely...the Board of Education gets absolutely nothing from the state for this bail out, let me call your attention to a few minutes ago when we authorized a school appropriation that went into such things as Title I and other goodies for the City of Chicago that are denied to downstate and to the suburban school districts. Now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is going too fast too far, and if we continue to give the Chicago Board of Education this authority, you can bet your life that they will be back here next year asking for a direct state bail out. I urge you to vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Redmond: : "Representative Huff,"

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think I should also inform you that the Financial Authority wasn't asking for just an increase

bonding authority, but also asking in the form of the School Board President that the powers of the general superintendent also be transferred to the chief financial officer. Mr. Speaker, if this gets...I want to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this particular measure. What it involves is \$73,000,000 of bonding. Now as you remember, the Chicago School Board as of now has to cut \$101,000,000 yet out of their...of next year's spending up there. The latest figures say that they've got that down to where they have to cut \$82,000,000. Well, the \$25,000,000 that we provide in this Act will still make a \$57,000,000 cut up there. If this school system should fail because we don't support it, the whole state system will be in jeopardy. This is a valid offer. This is something the City of Chicago needs, and I'm really surprised there isn't more people from the City of Chicago up on their feet talking about this instead of downstate defending them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think the reason some of us are skeptical about this Bill is the reason that things always turn up to be different than they are explained to us. Last year we were told, 'If you'll just go along with this program for the Chicago schools, they'll be on their own feet, they'll cut expenses, they'll get along with current money and so on.' It is only a few months now and here they are back, 'Now if you'll just do this for us, we'll be alright.' We

heard that about the RTA, too. Last year we passed a Bill, 'If you'll just do this for us, we'll be on our own.' Here they are now back wanting us to give money to the RTA. Who can you believe around here? I don't question the fact that these people say this in good faith, but I've been around long enough to know that you don't bail yourself out by borrowing money, and I don't think Chicago school districts can continue deficit spending and borrowing and ever get ahead. If they can, I'd like to figure out how they do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye', and 58 'no'. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I will ask for that verification. I persist."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmatives. Alexander, Anderson, Balanoff, Barnes, Beatty, Bell, Bianco, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Braun, Bullock, Burnidge..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry...Representative Huff."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that request for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff withdraws his request for a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. 105 'ayes', and 58 'nos'. The motion prevails. Wait till I find it on here...and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2975."

2955...Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 2955 is the Chrysler Bill. I renew my motion that the House concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2955. I'm sure that everyone has their analysis. Everyone is aware of the Chrysler Bill. We know what the economic impact is. It's been debated and written about so I urge support of the House to concur in those three Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? Previously.."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Previously, before you took this Bill out of the record, you were asked by the Gentleman from Champaign as to whether or not this Bill contains the restriction on the relocation or closure of the Chrysler Plant in Belvidere. What is the answer?"

Giorgi: "He has that information now and ..Tim Johnson has the information."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry. What is that?"

Giorgi: "Tim Johnson has the information."

Schlickman: "Well he was speaking on behalf of not only himself, but many others."

Giorgi: "All right. What it does is it allows the Director and the Governor to negotiate with Chrysler on that point, specific in the Bill."

Schlickman: "In other words, the prohibition on the removal or closure of the Chrysler Plant has been removed. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "That wasn't in the Amendment to begin with, in Amendment..that became the Bill. That was in a prior

Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further Representative Schlickman? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, unfortunately because of the omnibus appropriations process we have here and the fact that the appropriations for Chrysler was contained with about 14 other appropriations, many of which people support, this is really the only area that we can talk directly to. You know, all this screaming and hollering has been done in past debate and in Committee and on the floor in terms of the merits of this Bill. But through it all, and really more with the Bill as it's evolved, the principle still remains the same. And I guess a Roll Call on this vote really enunciates Members' positions on that principle. And that is, whether it ought to be public policy of the State of Illinois, for that matter, at the federal level, whether it ought to be the policy of the United States Government that government ought to subsidize failing industries. And as we've pointed out before, the establishment of that precedent to begin with, not only in terms of the philosophy, but in terms of the fiscal reality is unlimited and once we establish the principle that you can subsidize a failing business, where do you draw the line? How do you define the line? And isn't that antithetical of the whole concept of private enterprise that's given corporations and individuals in our free enterprise economy the right to fail as well as the right to succeed? I realize the arguments with respect to fiscal impact, but the same arguments can be made with

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

respect to anything that might involve a state subsidy. I told Representative Giorgi and I won't stand up and yell and scream, but I do believe that it's a principle that you ought to look at real closely. And in my mind it's a principle that as much as I respect the Sponsor and his intentions, ought to be rejected upon which people ought to vote 'no' on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ropp: "Mr. Representative, I understand that within this last week that the Chrysler Corporation has begun to receive federal monies. My question is, if they have...what impact will the passage of this Bill either plus or minus affect their continued receiving of federal monies?"

Giorgi: "The.. This Bill will just allow Chrysler to go to the Federal Loan Board and say that Illinois.. Illinois has joined us. They're going to give us 20 million dollars and the Federal Loan Control Board will give them an additional 20 million dollars."

Ropp: "In other words...they'll just get 20 million more and be able to stay open and operate whether or not we give them 20 million or not. Is that right?"

Giorgi: "I'm not privy to that...I don't know the answer to that question. I just know what our action will do."

Ropp: "I think I heard you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor

yield?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Griesheimer: "Representative Giorgi, did this Bill as it's now being voted on contain any other appropriation other than the appropriation for Chrysler Motor Corporation?"

Giorgi: "That is correct. There is no other appropriation."

Griesheimer: "All right, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak to the Bill. As this matter is before us today, we have one really rare opportunity that we have not had with many other Bills that have been presented to us. As Representative Johnson pointed out, many of the matters presented to us today are omnibus matters. You might be against bilingual education, but you have to take the bitter with the sweet in order to get a matter through. This is certainly not the case with this Bill. Thus, you can indeed vote a philosophical basis or maybe I should point out to you a Constitutional basis. Although we have gone through this matter in length before in debate, I would point out to this Body that very clearly in the Illinois State Constitution, under finance, which is Article VIII, it states that public funds, property or credit shall be used only for public purposes. I would like the transcript to clearly reflect when this matter is tested in court that what we are doing today is not only philosophically wrong, it is clearly unconstitutional in the State of Illinois. We have the responsibility as Representatives down here to vehemently guard the tax dollars of each of the people that we are elected to represent. In voting for this

matter today, we are not only not representing them, we are violating their trust. We are violating the Constitution of the State of Illinois. Chrysler Motor Corporation was destined to die long before this matter ever came before the United States Government or this Body. They were a poorly run organization that has not produced a good quality product for at least two decades. We are now, today, gambling with taxpayers' dollars and it's not even a good gamble. I would suggest to you that the Representative from Rockford has offered us better gambles in the lottery, in the bingo Bills and in many other matters which he has represented. Chrysler will indeed die and it will die within the next decade and when it dies, it will bury 20 million dollars of taxpayers' money. I ask anyone of you in the years ahead, whether you serve in this Body, another Body at a higher or lower level or you're retired; Are you ready to stand up and say, 'I was one of the Legislators that voted to tube 20 million dollars of your taxpayers' money, when in fact the schools were crying for money, when transportation throughout the state was crying for money, when our roads are in a deplorable condition?' Please use a little bit of common horse sense. Spend the taxpayers' money like you would your own money. We must vote this matter down. It's a tragedy for any Legislator to vote in favor of this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would address the Sponsor of this Amendment to Section 3.06. Would he please look at that and explain what it means? This is the definition of

qualified corporation. It says, 'qualified corporation means a corporation which is qualified to do business in the State of Illinois and which is eligible for federal loan guarantee under Public Law 96-185 enacted by the Congress of the United States.' What is the title of Public Law 96-185 and to which corporation or corporations does it refer, Representative from Rockford?"

Giorgi: "I understand that that is written around the Chrysler problem."

Skinner: "Is not the title of the Act the Chrysler Loan Guarantee Act of 1979?"

Giorgi: "I believe that is 100% correct."

Skinner: "Does it refer only to the Chrysler Corporation and to no other corporation?"

Giorgi: "At this point in time, yes. I don't know about next week."

Skinner: "Well, considering it's been signed, I would assume that that..it could not be amended. Now, I would also direct you to Article IV, Section 13, of the Illinois State Constitution. Section 13 is entitled, Special Legislation. It reads, 'The General Assembly shall pass no special law...no special or local law when a general law is or can be made applicable. Whether a general law is or can be made applicable shall be a matter for judicial determination.' What advice would you have for the Judicial Branch given the facts that the only eligible corporation under your proposed law is the Chrysler Corporation?"

Giorgi: "I think that the intent of this House is what we're about tonight and I think that's what the record is

going to show."

Skinner: "Would you repeat that? I'm afraid that I heard you."

Giorgi: "Repeat your question."

Skinner: "What advice would you have for the Judicial Branch with regard to the Bill which you wish to have enacted? How will you tell them that it is not a special law? Under what argument would you hide?"

Giorgi: "I'm not a barracks lawyer. Nor am I a Constitutional lawyer. And I wouldn't give the judiciary any advice. Having been a Member of the General Assembly that advocated home rule, and you know, self rule, I'm not about to stand on the floor of this House and start screaming Constitutionality because then it's not my domain, nor my province nor yours."

Skinner: "Well, it's quite obvious it's not your domain. Because you have sponsored a Bill which is blatantly unconstitutional..."

Giorgi: "I have a theory that it is Constitutional.."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm addressing the Act now. My questioning period has ended. When I was waiting in Baur's yesterday morning for a table at brunch, the couple at the table next to us were discussing the Chrysler bail out Bill. And I presume the Lady owns a bakery because she asked, 'What would happen if my bakery went under? Would I get a loan from the General Assembly?' And her husband laughed. I guess it was her husband. Anyway the guy with her laughed. I think that sort of indicates what this Bill is all about. This Bill is special interest legislation, but

it's not just special interest legislation in the generic sense. It's special legislation, I believe, in contravention to Section 13 of Article IV of the Illinois State Constitution. It so happens that I believe the Gentleman has tightened up the security. I don't think the State of Illinois will be in much harm of losing money if this corporation goes under. But I don't know how he can contend that this Bill affects any other corporation other than the Chrysler Corporation. There is one gaping hole in the Bill which I would direct my colleagues to. It is ...Let's see. Where is it? Section 5..."

Speaker Flinn: "Are you finished, Mr. Skinner?"

Skinner: "Section 5, paragraph six. It says, 'The borrower is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the loan pursuant to Section 4 except to the extent that such terms and conditions are modified, amended or waived by the Director.' So this means that all of the safeguards that have been put in this Bill and there are many safeguards in this Bill, all of them or any of them can be waived by the Director of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. I think this is placing too much power, delegating too much power to the Executive Branch. And although I have great confidence that the Director of this Department will not fail to uphold the public interests of the citizens of the State of Illinois, leaving this loophole in here bothers me very much. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Capuzi."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous

question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Sponsor, Representative Giorgi, is recognized to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I know that the three opponents are very well versed in the Bill and I think the points they've raised are very valid points and answered very well by the fine language in the Bill. The language was helped by Representative Skinner and Leinenweber. I'm proud of the language. The language was in such good shape that the Senate did not tamper with the language at all. And I renew my motion to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate..House Bill 2955."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 (sic) on House Bill 2955?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Robbins, one minute to explain your vote. It's 1, 2 and 3...."

Robbins: "I still think instead of voting 'aye' on this, you ought to do like I did, buy a new 1979 Chrysler. You'd help bail them all out. Then you would know why you should vote 'no' on this Bill. A poor product is a poor product and there's no way you can give them enough money to bail them out. Secondly, the Federal Government has bailed them out without our money so why should we throw good money after bad?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hudson, to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to report...repeat a point that I tried to make earlier

this Session and that is to consider the precedent we're setting here. Consider what it is we're really doing and I say that we are aiding and abetting the establishment in this country of corporate socialism. When you have big business and you have big labor in the form of the UAW and you have a company run by a Federal Review Board, as this is going to be run, at the federal level, put it all together and you have the establishment of corporate socialism. And by our vote here, we are simply aiding and abetting that process. I don't think that's what we want to establish in this country of free enterprise. And I would urge my colleagues, that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Neff, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Neff: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker. This motion should definitely be defeated. We're starting something here as the last speaker said. If we believe in the free enterprise system, then this is the wrong way to go. And another thing, I think we've all done our checking on this at all, know that we're fighting a dead horse here. We're not going to be able to bring it back alive and in sight of two or three years, this money is going to be going down the drain. And so this is the time. We had just as well stop it now. No one wants to see the Chrysler Corporation go under, but this is through their efforts and faults and it's going under and certainly, if we believe in the free enterprise system, we will vote 'no' on this issue."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Davis to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would any of my colleagues here, any one of you, who had luck enough to have ten thousand dollars, would you loan it to Chrysler? Think about it. Would you loan it to Chrysler? The answer is 'no', you wouldn't because you recognize one thing, that the lottery is the appropriate vehicle for this because Chrysler is still the biggest gamble in town."

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

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when this measure was introduced I was uneasy about it. But there are many, many compelling reasons I think to be supportive of this. I hear people that make statements that apparently they have a crystal ball as to what's going to happen to Chrysler in two years or five years. They don't know; I don't know. Let me take one second more, Mr. Speaker, to tell you quickly about a phone call that I received from a Lincoln-Mercury dealer on another matter. He said that I don't know what I'm going to do. He said, if we have any more publicity like the Pinto trial in Indiana, and the reverse jumping out of the automatic transmission. He said, 'I don't know what I'm going to do.' I, for one, Mr. Speaker, do not want to see General Motors as the only manufacturer of automobiles in the United States. I hope you don't, Mr. Speaker. And I hope there are some other Members that feel exactly the same way. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Meyers to explain his vote.
One minute. Timer's on."

Meyers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel a rather provincial interests and I must stand up and explain my 'no' vote. Quite frankly, the General Assembly is quit willing to write off south Cook County in Wisconsin Steel. They don't count. They live in a dirty area. For those reasons, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Griesheimer: "No, Mr. Speaker. I've already spoken in debate. If this persists at 89 or over, I would call for a verification. Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes. Who's asking for the floor?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I just said, I spoke in debate. If this persists over 89, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, okay. Fine. I was distracted. Representative Simms to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know to many of my Republican colleagues, philosophically, this is an extremely difficult vote, as it is for myself. However, I think there comes a time when we have to be practical. Here is an industry to a great extent that has been penalized because the over regulation of the federal government and many of the restrictions have been placed on it. Without this legislation that is being offered, this corporation will probably have to fold their plant. In northern Illinois, this is a devastating effect in applying the domino theory, there is potentiality of 15,000 people eventually that could be out of work,

and I would ask that Members of the House, both Republicans and Democrats, give this Bill sufficient numbers of votes to pass so we can have the economy of northern Illinois remain somewhat viable."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sam Wolf, to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had a question before the debate was closed. I fully support this measure. But I was curious before debate was closed as to what portion of this loan was secured by the first mortgage and what portion was secured by a second? However, if Representative Giorgi is going to speak again, perhaps he could answer that question when he talks."

Speaker Flinn: "Maybe he can do that in explaining his vote. Representative Bradley to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Bradley: "Just in explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to have a copy of the transcript of the remarks of Representative Simms on this particular issue. I think it's unique and when they transcribe them, I'd like to have a copy of the transcript sent to my office."

Speaker Flinn: "We'll see the Clerk's Office. We'll see that you get it. Any further discussion? Any further explanation of votes? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', and 72 'nays', and Representative Griesheimer has asked for a polling of the Affirmative vote. And Representative Giorgi asked for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Birchler. Hanahan."

Katz. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. McAuliffe.
Richmond. No further."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I have to go to Conference. Could
I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Flinn: "Leave is granted."

Katz. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. McAuliffe.
Richmond. No further."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevech."

Matijevech: "Mr. Speaker, I have to go to Conference. Could I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Flinn: "Leave is granted."

Speaker Flinn: "Margalus wishes to be verified. Okay? Representative Harris would like to be verified. I'm assuming these are all Conference Committee Members. Representative Chapman would like to be verified. Representative Sam Wolf would like to be verified. Representative Doyle would like to be verified. Doyle, Ed Doyle. Okay. The poll of the affirmative votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Beatty. Bianco. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallock. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kcrnowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevech. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Ronan. Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schraeder. Simms. Stanley. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Williams. Williamson. Sam Wolf."

Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

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

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded please?"

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Slape: "Would you please change that to 'aye'?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Richmond would like to be changed to 'aye'. Representative Birchler, for what purpose do you arise?"

Birchler: "How am I voted, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Speaker Flinn: "He would like to be voted as 'aye'. Any further changes before we start this challenge? Representative Rea. Okay. Representative Griesheimer do you have any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Griesheimer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Bianco?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bianco is in his seat."

Griesheimer: "Breslin?"

Speaker Flinn: "Breslin is standing over by her seat."

Griesheimer: "Capparelli?"

Speaker Flinn: "Capparelli is in the middle...right aisle."

Griesheimer: "Farley?"

Speaker Flinn: "Farley? I can't see back there in the dark.

If Farley is back there, would he waive his hand?

Nobody is waving his hand."

Griesheimer: "Kelly?"

Speaker Flinn: "Wait a minute. Let me take him off the

Roll. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Who was the last one?"

Griesheimer: "Kelly."

Speaker Flinn: "Kelly. I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Griesheimer: "Lechowicz."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Griesheimer: "Madigan?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan is in his seat."

Griesheimer: "Marovitz?"

Speaker Flinn: "Marovitz? The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? There he is, right back there in the back."

Griesheimer: "McClain?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McClain is down front here."

Griesheimer: "Mulcahey?"

Speaker Flinn: "Mulcahey you say?"

Griesheimer: "Yes, Mulcahey."

Speaker Flinn: "Mulcahey is back in the back and put Kelly back on. He's back there. And put Lechowicz back on. He's back there."

Griesheimer: "Patrick?"

Speaker Flinn: "Patrick is in his seat."

Griesheimer: "Pechous?"

Speaker Flinn: "Pechous is in his seat."

Griesheimer: "Pierce."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pierce? Jim, would you sit down a minute and let me see? Oh, he's in the back. Would some of you please get in your seats, at least some of you because I can't see half of the chairs on the floor. What's next? Pierce is here."

Griesheimer: "Simms?"

Speaker Flinn: "Simms is down here, middle aisle."

Griesheimer: "Stanley?"

Speaker Flinn: "Stanley? I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Griesheimer: "Stuffle."

Speaker Flinn: "Stuffle? Stuffle is over at the side. Over here."

Griesheimer: "Taylor."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Taylor. Way over at the side."

Griesheimer: "Telcser."

Speaker Flinn: "Telcser? I don't...don't see the Gentleman in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off of the Roll."

Griesheimer: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Flinn: "VonBoeckman's in his seat and Leverenz wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Leverenz. Ted Leverenz. Representative Barnes wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Stanley is back. Put him back on the Roll."

Griesheimer: "Williamson."

Speaker Flinn: "Who?"

Griesheimer: "Williamson."

Speaker Flinn: "Williamson. He's in the back, back there by Bullock. Sitting next to Bullock in Taylor's seat."

Griesheimer: "Willer?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Willer is standing over by her seat."

Griesheimer: "Representative Peters?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters? I don't see him in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Griesheimer: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Darrow wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. On this question there's 95 voting 'aye' and 70 voting 'nay'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 3 (sic) to House Bill 2955. Correction on that. The House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 on House Bill 2955. House Bill 2982, Representative Krska? We have an announcement to make here first. The Clerk does."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #3 was distributed and on Supplemental Calendar 3 there were three Bills that the back pages were mixed up when they were printed. They will be printed again and marked on the front, 'revised printing'. The three Bills that are being reprinted are House Bills 3432, Senate Bill 185, and Senate Bill 1626."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Representative Krska on House

Bill 2982."

Krska: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2982 which consists of the following; changes the maximum tax levy for Brookfield Zoo from 0.025% to 0.035%, authorizes issuance of 12 million dollars in new bonds for capital improvement at Brookfield Zoo at the maximum interest rate permissible, creates a working cash fund for Brookfield Zoo, gives the Forest Preserve District the authority to issue bonds for a working cash fund in the amount not to exceed \$1,500,000, authorizes an annual tax to repay the principal and interest. The funds from the bonds issued for the working cash fund shall not be regarded as an asset available for annual appropriation. They are funds to be used for operating expenses in anticipation of collection of taxes. When collected, the taxes shall be applied first to payment of the funds. Gives the Forest Preserve District Board the authority to transfer money from the working cash funds to the zoo operating fund and describes the mechanics for the transfer. Changes maximum tax levy for the Botanical Gardens from 0.0076% to 0.015%. And authorizes issuance of one million dollars in bonds for capital improvement at the Botanical Gardens at the maximum interest rate possible. And I would greatly appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Braun. Braun."

Braun: "Question of the speaker, Mr. Spon...of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he'll yield."

Braun: "Is this a tax increase without referendum?"

Krska: "Yes it is, but a minimal. It's going from ...it's a tax increase of one/tenth of one percent compared to what it's going to do."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill does have two or three tax increases on it without any kind of referendum either front door or back door. It has authorizations for working cash fund bonds and capital bonds in it without any front or back door referendum. In the original Bill which we will be approving if we approve concurrence, validates the appropriation and tax levy ordinances for the Cook County Forest Preserve District and the Cook County Board. I would like to remind you that this original validation Bill is introduced in order to okay after the fact illegally adopted appropriation and tax levy ordinances for Cook County, in spite of the fact that other counties managed to adopt their ordinances properly. This is in order to prevent taxpayers from successfully protesting their taxes if they are protesting them on the basis of the invalidity of the appropriation and tax levy ordinance. There are three good reasons for voting against this Bill; the awful wrong practice of validating the appropriation and tax levy ordinance for Cook County and the Forest Preserve District, the tax increases without referendum, and the bond authorization without referendum. I urge you to vote

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

'no' on this concurrence motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, Representative Krska to close."

Krska: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen. It is a slight tax increase of one/tenth of one percent. But the cost to put it on a referendum would be more than what we're going to collect. And therefore, I again move for concurrence and a favorable vote. I thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Any further discussion? Representative Getty. Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. I'm trying to get a Calendar going here. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2982?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Now, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. This indeed is a concurrence that is much needed. By adopting this Senate Amendment, we will place the... we'll be placed in the posture of permitting them to make enough money to be self-sustaining in the future. By permitting additional parking facilities, for example, we will not be turning away 20% of the visitors on heavy days. We will have additional facilities. We will have a better system entirely. This is something that we need and in every good society, we develop types of things such as this that make our society indeed wonderful. I would suggest that this should receive a resounding 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz, to explain his vote. One minute. Lechowicz? You've got your light on. Let's go."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe Representative Getty accurately portrayed the true impact of the concurrence on Amendment #1 to House Bill 2982. It's an item that is really needed in our area of the state. It generates an amount of.. not only a certain amount of educational aspects for the people who visit these institutions, but it's also tremendous tourism aspect from peoples throughout the state. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, it's wonderful to me to think that I and 177 of us together can stick the people of Cook County and the area up there with another tax increase and they haven't a thing to say about it, no referendum. That's just wonderful. I hope to heaven they don't do it to us sometime."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'nay'. Representative Hudson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hudson: "Request a verification of the Affirmative Roll, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hudson requests a verification. Representative Krska asks that we poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Balanoff. Boucek. Collins. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Hoffman. Dave Jones..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Balanoff wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. McAuliffe."

Meyer. Neff. Oblinger. Richmond. Schlickman.
Stearney. E.G. Steele. And, Winchester."

Speaker Flinn: "McAuliffe wishes to be recorded as voting
'aye'. Representative McAuliffe. Representative
DiPrima, for what purpose do you arise?"

DiPrima: "I'd like to be verified. I've got a Conference
here."

Speaker Flinn: "Could Representative DiPrima be verified?
Representative Hudson? Okay, for DiPrima, right?
Okay. And Representative Margalus wishes to be
verified. Yes. Let the Clerk catch up.
Representative Pechous wishes to be verified. No, we
just started, Billy. Representative Epton wishes to
be recorded as voting 'aye'. Any further changes
before we get into challenges of the affirmative?
Would the Clerk give us a count of what we're starting
with? I'd like to advise Mr. Hudson. Mr. Hudson
there are 102 voting 'aye'. Do you wish to persist
in your verification? He says, hold the phone.
Representative Beatty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Beatty: "Could I be verified please?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman wishes to be verified. Okay.
No objection. Representative Hudson."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McClain. Representative
McClain? For what purpose do you arise?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, leave to be verified. I have to go
to Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Leave granted? Leave granted.
Representative Hudson?"

Hudson: "Persist in the verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Representative Keane wishes to be verified. Keane. Terzich also. Okay. And Stearney wishes to be verified. Oh, mark him 'aye'. I'm sorry. Stearney votes 'aye'. Collins 'aye'. It's 104 now, George."

Hudson: "Okay, Mr. Speaker. I'll withdraw the request."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman withdraws his request. On this question there are 104 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'nay'. And House Bill 2982, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2982. Represent... Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you arise?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the point of an inquiry. A lot of Members are asking what our schedule might be. I don't know whether there was an announcement. I gather we're going to work right through and take no break for dinner. But some of us were wondering whether we order...should order out or not."

Speaker Flinn: "Pretty soon the real Speaker will be back up here and you can ask him, but my guess is that there won't be any breaks for anything. All right. Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you arise? Oh, Representative Giorgi, I'm sorry. 2976. House Bill 2976. We skipped over Giorgi a while ago. I apologize, Zeke."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 2976 is the Bill that allows local units of government, namely counties and cities in any unincorporated areas, counties, to license for chances. This Bill ...The motion is to concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2976. The

first Amendment corrected the misspelled word, from 'renumeration' to 'remuneration', and the second Amendment is in the Bingo Act and it establishes a new top for a bingo prize for the day. It increases from 2250 to 3400 the size of the maximum bingo award to be made in any given day. The original Bill on chances was passed last Session, was vetoed by the Governor and in his Veto Message, he asked me to help rewrite a Bill again. And with the help of his Department of Revenue and some of his legal counsel, we rewrote a Bill that we think is acceptable. On the bingo issue, it has been worked out with the Department of Revenue and I know of no objections to the Bill to Senate Amendments 1 and 2. And I urge the House to adopt Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2976."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2976?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Kelly, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kelly: "Well, I.. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask the Sponsor a question. He used the word 'chances' and I'd really like to know what that word 'chances' means in the way of..."

Speaker Flinn: "You missed your opportunity because I asked for.. I didn't see your light on if you had it on."

Kelly: "It was on."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, okay. We'll let Representative Giorgi explain his vote. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Well, I think Representative Kelly knows what we're doing here. We're rewriting something that's been

practiced in the State of Illinois for the last 100 years. What we're doing is allowing the PTA and the Booster Club to conduct their raffles and chances without the use of any gambling paraphernalia on any athletic event. It's the.. You put your name in a box or in a hat and you draw it. And that's the extent of this Bill and this Bill, I didn't tell you earlier, self destructs January 1st, 1983 in the event abuses creep into the Act."

Speaker Flinn: "Are there any further explanation of votes? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye' and 50 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 2976. 3047. Representative Capuzi. Where is Doc at? Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, I request a second Conference Committee hearing on House Bill 3047. It seems that the Conference Committee did not agree and therefore, they've all requested a second Committee and I'd appreciate your appointing the Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that we adopt..appoint a second Conference Committee on House Bill 3047. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed? The 'ayes' have it. Second Conference Committee will be appointed. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Don't you have to go through the mechanics of adopting that first report?"

Speaker Flinn: "No, we did not adopt it."

Collins: "Well, no you want to adopt the first Committee report which says we're hopelessly locked and want a second one. We want that report adopted because it says we can't agree."

Speaker Flinn: "I thought we had already failed to adopt it. We have it marked on the Calendar."

Collins: "Either..Whichever way."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. The Clerk tells me we're all right. Okay. On Supplemental Calendar #2, the first Bill is House Bill 524. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur on Conference Committee report #2 to 524."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House concur...' Representative.. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this motion to approve the Conference Committee report. House Bill 524 has a long history. This is the Bill that originally would have mandated that insurance companies would have to write full coverage insurance on glass insurance on your automobile policy. The Sponsor has come up with a new Conference Committee report which does not exactly mandate that coverage, but would require that all insurance companies and agents go through a procedure of offering full coverage insurance on automobile glass insurance. I think that that's a foolish thing for us to do. It will not accomplish the objective of the glass industry which was to require that all of us would

have to pay full coverage glass insurance. Really all it will do is cause a great inconvenience and expense to insurance companies that are affording this coverage, and to agents who are trying to service your policies. There are also some problems in the drafting of this legislation. I have a letter from the Department of Insurance in which they point out that one of the problems with the drafting of the language is that the insuran..the burden of proof would be upon the insurance companies to show whether or not they had made the offer that the Sponsor is mandating on those companies, and therefore, probably the only way they could comply with the law would be to make a written offer to the insured and get some kind of written rejection from the insured. I think that's an unreasonable burden to place upon the insurance companies and an unreasonable expense to require of them. I think all in all that this is an attempt to do something which doesn't need to be done. The majority of insurance companies in Illinois are now offering glass insurance on both the full coverage basis and a deductible basis and you and I can chose whichever option we want. It's an idea which should be rejected and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huff to close."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, if the last speaker's correct...."

Speaker Flinn: "Just a minute, Representative Huff. Apparently Representative Stearney's light was on, so you'll close next. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Stearney: "Representative Huff, this wouldn't be any added increase, would it?"

Huff: "No, it would not."

Stearney: "And, the way the legislation is designed is rather to protect the consumer am I right?"

Huff: "That's right. There's a safety factor involved with cracked glass on the highway that impairs vision, Representative Stearney. This Bill is an attempt to facilitate insurance to have quicker replacement of their cracked glass windshield."

Stearney: "Well, thank you. Well, Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the question..."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Stearney: "...I see nothing wrong with the measure. I think it is beneficial to the consumer. It removes traffic safety hazards and there's nothing wrong., And I think we should move to adopt Conference Committee report #2 as Representative Huff has suggested. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huff to close."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If as the..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, there were no lights on a minute ago and I backed up and...Why don't...Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Bill and suggest to you that Senate Amendment #1 provides.. has no consumer interest in it whatever and is a provision to benefit the glass industry. Not as bad as it was when we considered it several months ago and defeated it

soundly, but nevertheless, bad and certainly a foot in the door. What it says is that glass damage must be considered totally apart from other damage to an automobile that is a typical comprehensive claim. There's no reason on earth to consider that glass should be any different than brakes that are cut by a vandal or headlights that are broken by a vandal or by some other cause, not a collision. The only reason for supporting this at all would be to benefit the glass industry and I don't see why they deserve this. This would require that the consumer, the automobile consumer, be asked especially if he wants no deductible glass coverage. Now, if he's asked that question, typically he would say yes. The effect of that would be that he would be paying an additional premium, a premium that perhaps he could not afford. This is a nuisance, Mr. Speaker, to the consumer. It's a nuisance to the agent. It's a nuisance to the company. And I suggest to you that you vote 'no' on this concurrence."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's been some lack of information here. When you say that an insurance company is going to furnish full coverage for glass at the same price they did at a \$50.00 deductible, you just don't know anything about insurance. And certainly no customer would be willing to pay the difference in cost if it were explained to him. Now, I have no objection to a customer saying, 'I want full coverage' and paying the price, but when you have to go to that customer and say, 'You've got full

coverage'; 'You don't want it, do you?', and then get a signed statement, that's a different ball of wax entirely. And I think that no one's going to order it, but they will deny it. It just makes an extra burden on the industry and run your insurance costs up altogether."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. With all due respect to my colleague, if I understand the Conference Committee report correctly, I think we're placing the insurance companies in the position where they're going to offer glass coverage on a full coverage basis. Now, in my district, we're having lots of problems as it is in keeping insurance companies writing coverage in the area and in the district. I'm just afraid that if we add this additional road block, we're going to lose a lot more companies than we already have. On this basis, I'm going to have to approve....oppose this motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster. Deuster. Representative Huff to close."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In this Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen, the state nor the insurance company is made to impose a course of action, but rather to offer the insured a choice as to whether he wants comprehensive coverage or a deductible. If Mr. Schuneman is to be believed and the insurance company is already doing this, offering this, well, what is the objection? As of right now, Ladies and Gentlemen, the unit cost for the deductible without the comprehensive is \$4.00....is

less than \$4.00. With the implementation of this Amendment, that unit cost will still be under \$4.00, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a consumer Bill. This is a good Bill. It offers a choice as it should be to the insured. If he doesn't want the comprehensive coverage, he doesn't have to pay for it. It won't reflect in his premium. And I think if the insured wants the comprehensive coverage, that choice should be his. I think this is a good Bill and it's deserving of an affirmative vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 524?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bullock to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Huff's motion. And I'm asking for an affirmative vote on this Bill. Clearly as one of the previous speakers indicated, this is a pro-consumer measure, at no cost to the insurance industry. I'm surprised that one of the Gentleman of this Conference Committee, who refused to sign this report, would stand up on the floor of this House and for some innocuous reason object to this pro-consumer measure. Representative Huff has worked long and hard on this measure and I certainly think all of you who want to carry something back to your district and say that you really helped the people, that this is one measure that you can say really helped the little people."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'nay'. And the House does not concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Representative Kosinski wishes to vote 'aye'. Pechous, 'aye'. Henry wishes to vote 'aye'. Kelly, 'aye'. Representative Huff?"

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I have a poll of the absentees please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. He has that right. I didn't recognize Representative Huff. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, you informed the Clerk to take the record. What was the record, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "The record was 69 'ayes', but there are some changing their votes and I... There were a bunch of lights on. Our lights are not working properly here. I haven't declared it lost anyway...."

Schuneman: "It looks that it's unlikely at this point, Mr. Speaker, but if this should reach the required number I want a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. All right. Fine. Representative Matula. For what purpose do you arise?"

Matula: "Mr. Speaker, mark me 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Matula, 'no'. Okay. Anybody else for changes before we... Representative Preston. Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you tell me how I am recorded?"

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, would you change me to being recorded as voting 'aye'?"

Speaker Flinn: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. All right. Representative Margalus. For what purpose do you arise? Representative Margalus. Margalus, 'aye'. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to point out to the Chair and to the Members of the House that while most of us sit here and vote on some of these Bills, the Senate has decided to recess and go to dinner. Now, we have a little bit of material left to do, but it would seem to me that the wisest thing for us to do at this point is to join the Senate seeing as they're not going to come back until 8:00 o'clock anyway and you're going to need both Houses back on these things and that the real Speaker ought to get in the Chair and let us go out for recess for an hour and a half for dinner."

Speaker Flinn: "You have your Leader talk to my Leader and we'll talk it over. All right. The Gentleman has asked for a poll of the absentees. What is the count before we start polling the absentees? Representative Yourell wishes to vote 'aye'. There are 76 'ayes', Representative Huff. You want a polling of the absentees I take it?"

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what I'd like to do at this time, if I may, is take it out of the record."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I don't think we can do that. Poll the absentees."

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I have Postponed Consideration then?"

Speaker Flinn: "He's asked leave for Postponed Consideration."

Huff: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "No objections? Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the second Conference Committee report on this Bill and I believe the Bill should either be voted up or down now. I don't think that Postponed Consideration is the proper...."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, if you're raising objection, why..."

Schuneman: "Yeah, I do object, Mr. Speaker. We've been through this enough times on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Let me check with the Parliamentarian. Will the Parliamentarian come out? I think we might be out of order objecting to a Postponed Consideration. I think we've always let the Sponsor do that."

Schuneman: "I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Postponed Consideration. House Bill 3758. Representative Garmisa. 38. House Bill 3538, I'm sorry."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3538."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is...Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "First, what's the Bill about and second, what is the Amendment?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3538 would join Illinois with the other midwestern states of Indiana, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, and Kentucky in the interstate high speed inner-city rail passenger network compact. The purpose of the compact

is to study the feasibility of connecting the major cities of the midwest by high speed rail passenger service, similar to the so-called 'bullet trains' of Japan and the new high speed systems in England and France. Since each of the compact states will do their own studies, that would be sharing of information already developed by...the main that's being developed by Ohio. And any compact costs above those absorbed by IDOT's regular budget will be requested for a specific appropriations in future years. Because Illinois's existing Amtrack service indicates upgrading of its existing service may be more prudent than building totally new facilities, such as are complicated by Ohio, we have added a requirement that IDOT in cooperation with the Transportation Study Commission undertake as well, a comprehensive review to formulate recommendations for the maintenance and the improvement of existing service, including the speed, the scheduling, the frequency and the reliability of such service. The feasibility and cost of high speed electric powered trains in the Chicago-St. Louis and Chicago Milwaukee Corridor that has been using Illinois coal for power generation, shall be specifically considered as one special study. To insure continued involvement of the Illinois General Assembly Senate Amendment #1 mandates that one of the two Illinois representatives of the compact's governing Body would be appointed by the Transportation Study Commission and the other would be the Secretary of Transportation. The Transportation Study Commission which I chair, has reviewed this

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

concept and it's endorsed its enactment. Beyond the study of existing service, which is long overdue, we are committed to nothing beyond listening to the proposals of our sister states. And if, in the future we decide that this is our vote, to move toward the high technological innovations, then the machinery will be already in place to develop sound funding proposals for consideration by this General Assembly. I move your approval."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that really wasn't the Gentleman's summation of this Bill. It in fact, was an answer to a question I asked and the reason it's so long is of course that Senate Amendment #1 which we're being asked to adopt here in final action creates an entirely new Bill, totally new to this chamber of the General Assembly. It was an Amendment to the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act which did something with interest rates and bonds up in the metropolitan transit authority, which I guess is in Chicago. This does create or does obligate the State of Illinois to join with some other states in some kind of a compact which is to prepare and expend money for a feasibility study in relation to some kind of an interstate rail passenger network. This subject of course has not been heard in Committee, at least in Committee in the House. It's new to us. I think we're being asked to vote blindly to put us into some kind of a deal with other states which is undoubtedly going to bring along vast financial obligations in order to put this high speed rail network into operation. I think this is poor legislative practice

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

to..wanning hours on June 30th, to consider this wholly new subject for the first time. We really don't know. Apparently, we will have to appropriate money in order to pay our expenses and our share of the burden for this. So, we would be able, at some later time, probably to consider that. However, if we are in this compact, we're going to hit with a 'fait accomplis'. We really probably will not have a legitimate free choice in the matter. I notice there's a withdrawal requirement of six months notice by the State of Illinois. I don't think this is a good idea in summation for us just two or three hours short of adjournment to consider for the first time some vast new program with some unknown cost which I'm certain will be enormous. So I would urge either a 'present' or a 'no' vote and reject this approach."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Yeah, Representative Garmisa, I like the concept in this and I think it's a good idea. The question I have though is, are there special interests given to the Chicago-St.Louis and the Chicago-Milwaukee Corridors? And, neither Wisconsin nor Missouri are included in the states listed in Section 1 and I'm wondering why."

Garmisa: "Well, in answer to your question, Representative Kane, the Transportation Study Commission has met with the various Commissions of these other states. As a matter of fact, they all flew into O'Hare Airport to make it easy for us, to explain graphically and from

movies that they had shown, all the advantages to a six state compact and we very definitely are including the Chicago to St. Louis, Chicago-Milwaukee, and Missouri is in the compact and any of the states that we feel that will be vital to Illinois high speed rail service will be included in this compact. And in answer to the speaker that spoke before you, if I may, the ...this is not a new concept. This is a concept that's been going around for quite some time and we feel that at this point in time, we should get something going so that we are at least on the track. We believe that.. We're not talking about any involved expenses here. What we are talking about is the Illinois Department of Transportation to look into the matter along with the Transportation Study Commission to check out whether or not there is a feasibility of this compact and from what we've seen and what has been presented to us at this point, we feel that it is highly desirable to look further into this matter. And the longer we delay, the longer the... and the longer we're going to be without the type of service that's sorely needed in rail service, in good rail service, and the higher the cost will be if we were to delay any longer."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it in the opinion of the

Chair. And Representative Garmisa is recognized to close."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've heard all the arguments for this and I think that the Bill is a good Bill. It makes good sense. It's something we should all look forward to and it deserves everybody's green light."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt ...or concur rather with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3538?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The t.v. lights are off. Representative Borchers, to explain his vote. One minute."

Borchers: "I do want to explain. Quite some years ago I mentioned this very thing upon the floor of the House. This is advanced into the future. Now, I've traveled extensively in Europe on the 'Rapids', for example they call them in France, Switzerland, Germany. They are very efficient. I don't need to explain to you our troubles in relation to gas and oil. You know that. But I assure you this is a way we should go and the time to start is now. I also remind you of what you, I know, have read about Japan and their efficiency in their 'Rapids' or their transportation."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further explanation of votes? Have all voted who wish? - All right. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Yeah..."

Speaker Flinn: "You spoke in debate..."

Kane: "No, I asked a question."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, that's the same thing as speaking. Go ahead. I'll violate the rules as long as there is no objection."

Kane: "The only thing I would say is there were charges made that this was going to be a large new program. All this does is authorize the study to see whether it's feasible or not. I think that in terms of high gasoline and energy costs, that this is the direction that we're going to have to be going in the future. And we at least should study it and see if it's feasible here in the midwest and I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 101 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'nay'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. Representative Marovitz on House Bill 3271."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 3271. When the Bill came up originally, one of the arson packages, when the Bill came up originally, Representative Scullickman rightly pointed out that a Section was left out having to do with what a violation was if they fail to disclose the beneficial interest. That was inadvertantly left out. We put it back in. In addition to that, we have put in effectively House Bill 2947 which was Representative Catania's Bill which passed out of the House 162 to nothing, which seeks to insure that the fire prevention fund is maintained for purposes for which it was created and not depleted. It would leave any

lapsed money in the fire prevention fund rather than transferring it to the general revenue fund. In 1979 the fire service in Illinois recognized the fact that the fund was inadequate and could not support program expansions which were needed to reduce fire and fire fatalities. This helps the city of Chicago Fire Academy, the University of Illinois, State Fire Academy, State Fire Marshal. And I would ask for an affirmative vote to adopt Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 3271."

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

Brummer: "Yes, you eliminate language in the current law which requires that any portion of the special fund remaining unexpended at the end of the year shall be paid into the general revenue fund. What has been remaining historically during the last few years in that fund and turned in to the general revenue fund? How many dollars are we talking about?"

Marovitz: "Fiscal year '79, there was no money transferred to the general revenue fund. In '78 there was \$500,000 transferred to the general revenue fund. The grant-in-aid program which reimburses local Fire Departments for training of fire personnel, was originally paid from GRF funds, but in '79 we reached an agreement with the Governor's Office and the Bureau of the Budget to fund these grants from the fire prevention fund and it's very important for the establishment and the continued viability of fire prevention, arson prevention, the city of Chicago Fire Academy, the State of Illinois Fire Academy, that we

leave this money in the fire prevention fund rather than transfer it back to grf."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kane. The t.v. lights are back on. Stearney. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. Conference Committee report, I believe, adopted certain Senate Amendments which tighten up the Bill, namely to require that the Fire Marshal first have some probable cause to believe that there was arson before he could make inquiry as to the beneficial owners of certain property. Second of all, it then said that all information that the fire inspectors would require is to be maintained in confidence until such time as it was required to be divulged to someone for a criminal or civil proceeding. So the Bill as has come back to us is much tighter than it was when it left the House and I would certainly recommend an 'aye' vote on this particular matter."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Marovitz to close. Representative Bowman. I'm sorry. Representative Bowman. I didn't see your light."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Bowman: "Representative Marovitz, does the state Fire Marshal get any money from general revenue or will he be getting money from the general revenue for operations, that is to say, hiring of personnel and so forth for routine sorts of things like boiler inspections, for example? Or does he get it all out

of the fire prevention fund?"

Marovitz: "The answer to that question is 'no'. He does not get any money for that."

Bowman: "From where? General revenue?"

Marovitz: "That was your question, right?"

Bowman: "Right. Okay, so in the practical effect of this Amendment then would be to leave money in the fire prevention fund which could be tapped for operations of the department as well as for the training program and things like that that they fund?"

Marovitz: "That's exactly right. Help units of local government purchase equipment to combat arson, training programs for local fire and law enforcement agency personnel, the city of Chicago Fire Academy, the State of Illinois Fire Academy..."

Bowman: "No, I understand that. I have no objection about keeping money in the fund for training purposes. I'm just wondering though it's rather unusual that we leave money..loose money laying around for an agency to get its hands on for operation purposes without, you know, keeping a little tighter control over it. And I just wondered if you really intended...if the intent of this legislation is to maximize the amount of money available for grants, but whether it is to maximize the amount of money available for operations of the agency."

Marovitz: "The intent of the legislation is to maximize the amount of money for fire prevention, for arson prevention, for the training of personnel, not for the hiring of additional individuals."

Bowman: "Not for the hiring of additional positions?"

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Bowman: "But the money would be there?"

Marovitz: "Well, the money is there.."

Bowman: "Okay. I just wanted to establish the record as to exactly what this does and what your intention is. Thank you."

Marovitz: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Marovitz to close."

Marovitz: "This is an excellent piece of legislation. It's an anti-arson Bill, anti-arson legislation. It's House Bill 2947 which leaves money in the state Fire Marshal's fund, was sponsored by Susan Catania. Passed 162 to nothing. It's on here because it didn't get out of the Senate Rules and I would ask for an affirmative Roll Call and adoption of Conference Committee report #1 to 3271."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3271?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Williams to explain his vote. The t.v. lights are off during explanation of votes."

Williams: "All right, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just happen to think this is a real excellent Bill and everyone should vote for it. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay'. And House Bill 3271, is passed, having received the Constitutional Majority. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1(sic). Or, rather, adopt the first Conference Committee. I'm sorry about that. Okay,

Billy. Got that right? Senate Bill 1639. Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you arise? Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I just wondered what order you were taking now?"

Speaker Flinn: "We're going to go on some appropriation Bills and try to get them out of the way of that magic 107 number."

Hoffman: "Fine. No problem. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the first Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1639 concurred in all the House Amendments, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. And additionally we corrected a technical error in the appropriation for PKU testing. There was no dollar change. We added \$950,000 for secondary care for premature and high risk infants and their mothers. And we added \$26,900 for medical preparation for rheumatic fever patients in order to continue an existing program. We added \$130,000 for a maternal and child health fund for nonrecurring expenses associated with maternal and child health care services. This is the substance of what the Conference Committee did. I now offer a move that the House adopt Conference Committee #1 to 1639."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 1639?' 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 132

voting 'aye', 13 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1639. Senate Bill 2000, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the only change that the conferees did on Senate Bill 2000 was to add the Minority Spokesman and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the report which they must send out annually. I offer to move the adoption of Conference Committee #1 to Senate Bill 2000."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 2000?' 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 137 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference... Representative Yourell, 'aye'. And Keane 'aye'. ..Does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 2000. House Bill 3034, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House concur in the Conference Committee report #1. What happened in Committee is that the Senate receded from Senate Amendment #1 and agreed to place some...agreed then to put \$26,000 back into the appropriation measure as it passed the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 3034?' 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 109 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3034. Senate Bill 1632, Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1632, the Conference Committee report that the Senate concurs in House Amendment #1 and the House recedes from House Amendment #2 and that Senate Bill 1632 be further amended as follows; to add \$53,300 in personal services. What the Conference Committee really did was to take out \$16,000, a little over \$16,000 that had been put in by the House. So, the Conference Committee recommends that we adopt the Conference Committee report."

Speaker Flinn: "We will stand at ease for a minute. We've got to put in some new paper in the machine. We've overworked the machine. How about messages from the Senate while we stand by?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary; Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit; Senate Joint Resolutions #123 and 124. Adopted by the Senate June 30th, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, one hour ago I inquired as to whether

the Speaker might be able to give the Members some indication as to whether there was going to be any kind of break for dinner and I know it's a difficult decision, but some Members want to know whether to send out for food or not. And it seems to me it's something that the Speaker could simply give us a little yes or no or some general hint if there is going to be a break...."

Speaker Flinn: "My general hint is if you're hungry send out for it."

Deuster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is, has the Conference Committee report been distributed on this, 1632? I don't seem to have one."

Speaker Flinn: "The answer is yes. One right behind you there. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the highest regard for the Chair and the person in the Chair right now, but I don't know how many Members actually know the existence of Rule 55-B. We couldn't help but notice in debate how many times that rule is violated. That rule in essence says when anybody is recognized by the Chair, they start by acknowledging that recognition and saying, 'Mr. Speaker.' And, I think that decorum is well worth a reminder as we wind down. I think it's a responsibility that we have for the decorum and I think very few of us recognize that that rule is there."

Speaker Flinn: "Thank you for reminding us. All right. Ready for the question on Senate Bill 1632. The

question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1632?' 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 125 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1632. Senate Bill 1626, Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 for Senate Bill 1626. This is the OCE for Industrial Commission. The report recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendment #1 which restores \$120,750 for EDP and accountant III, adds \$301,000 for 28...to help the Commission document case decisions, adds \$175,000 of the \$240,000 we had recommended for informational booklets. I move the adoption of the Conference Committee report."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 1626?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'nay'. And the House does concur.. adopt Conference Committee #1 to Senate Bill 1626. 3208, House Bill 3208, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 3208. The Amendment #6 which we had

some problems with, we had to change the language in order that the Comptroller's Office would be able to pay these awards if there were approved by the Court of Claims and we added one award for \$32,881.98 which brings it to \$215,400.66....And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move for the adoption of Conference Committee report #1."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Dwight Friedrich."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Have all of the items in this Conference Committee report now been approved by the Court of Claims?"

Taylor: "They have."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Confer... adopt Conference Committee #1 to House Bill 3208?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 3208. Senate Bill 1624. Representative Karpel. Is she back there? Not back there. Take that out of the record. 3046, Representative Pullen. House Bill 3046."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House not accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3046 and request that a

Second Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Conference Committee that met for this report, I make a substitute motion that we accept the Conference Committee Report. That issue, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the issue here is the pay raise for the state police. The...a Majority of the Conference Committee had supported that pay raise. I think that this House will also support the pay raise, and we've debated that issue before, and I would urge the Membership...89 of you...to support the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Representative Matijevich, earlier in the day, the Speaker ruled that as a matter of courtesy to the Sponsor, they recognized that motion first...their motion first whatever it be, and then if it fails, of course, your motion would be in order."

Matijevich: "Oh, alright. I wasn't here. I..."

Speaker Flinn: "That was ruled earlier today."

Matijevich: "Well in that case, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge the Membership to vote 'no' on Penny Pullen's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Mautino. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Pullen's motion for a Second Conference Committee and would hope that we could do that and get some problems ironed out that we have there."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "I don't...I think we should go ahead on the vote on this and then if we do not concur then I have some things to say."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this First Conference Committee Report was not signed by three Members of the Conference Committee, including the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee that heard this Bill. There is an opportunity to go to a Second Conference Committee and see if we can work out the differences in the First Conference Committee. I think when three Members of this House out of five who serve on the Conference Committee do not sign the report, that we ought to take that into consideration. The...Conference Committee Report as written would put the budget nearly one million dollars over the budget as it was proposed and approved by this House. I urge you to reject this Conference Committee Report so that we may appoint a Second Conference Committee and resolve the issues."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is that we do not adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3046. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Darrow to explain his vote, one minute. Timer's on."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to explain my vote. I am voting 'no'. I feel that the state police do need this money. They have been doing an excellent job, and we have to keep the profession...professionals there and keep them going."

Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Darrow, were you finished? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 34 voting 'aye', 115 voting 'nay', and the motion loses. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move to accept the Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3046."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I request that my name be removed as Sponsor of this Bill and that it be transferred to Representative Polk who has led the charge so ably on this issue."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, now she can have a perfect record. She doesn't have to vote for any appropriation Bills."

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

Johnson: "Well, I hope it's not necessary. As much as I respect the fiscal responsibility of Representative Pullen, the issue, as Representative Matijevich has pointed out, is whether our state troopers who have fallen so far behind in the past in terms of their pay scale and in light of what their job is, deserve a moderate...modest...moderate pay increase. I think they do. I think this is a reasonable approach. It is the middle ground, and I certainly urge a 'yes' vote on this motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House. I guess it is a fashionable thing and a very big thing to be the savior of the state police and have set yourselves up as more experts than the Department of Law Enforcement, but this is two years in a row now that people have come in and have ripped off the Governor's budget giving unauthorized pay raises, pay raises that were unasked for by the professionals, pay raises that we have received testimony from the Department they didn't want in spite of the fact that the Department has their own pay raise plan, and has presented it to us time and time again. So we're...by the experts. We're going to give the state police the pay raises. This makes us big heroes in somebody's eyes, but it doesn't make anybody a hero. And those who want to attain reasonable pay raises for everybody, and yet live within a balanced budget...this is a rip-off and if it...beyond that, I think it is sheer cowardice."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3046?' Representative Polk, you wish to speak? I didn't see your light on here. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Go ahead and take the Roll, and then I will explain my vote."

Speaker Flinn: "All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman, I have been out in front on this ever since it has happened. I tried to share with the Sponsor of this legislation what I was doing. I went on and made my Roll Call,

and I will tell you why I did that. If you'll look at the city of Hillsdale, or Elk Grove, or 'Erword', or Morton, or Peoria, or Pekin, you'll find that each and every one of those cities hire in state police, hire in first time policemen at a higher pay than we do the Illinois State Police. That...the trooper today hires in today at \$14,700. You can leave there and go to Chicago and get \$16,524 as a rookie policeman. Now we don't think that the men and the women of the State of Illinois who are our...who are our state troopers should be considered to be the number one law enforcement people in this state...then I don't know what's wrong. I sincerely believe that they deserve this four point two pay...percent pay increase."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryan to explain his vote."

Ryan: "No, Mr. Speaker, to tell you that it has got 177 votes, I am going to verify it."

Speaker Flinn: "You have the right to do that, Sir. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay', and Representative Ryan has requested a verification."

Ryan: "Yes, I persist."

Speaker Flinn: "He withdraws."

Ryan: "No, I did not withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. I persist in a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, you're persisting. A poll of the affirmative votes."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson, Ackerman,...."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose

do you rise?"

Matijevid: "You never can tell, we might get a couple more.

I wish a Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Flinn: "I think you have a right to. Why don't we back off and poll the absentees first. Representative Emil Jones wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Poll the absentees first."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander, Bluthardt, Capuzi, Casey, Deuster, Henry, Hudson, Huff, Klosak, Kucharski, Laurino,..."

Unknown: "Turn me off. Turn me off."

Clerk Leone: "Margalus, McAuliffe,..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McAuliffe,...McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to vote 'aye' on this Bill for all my friends on the state police, and because also I travel Route 55 quite frequently, and I wouldn't be caught dead voting against this."

Speaker Flinn: "McAuliffe, 'aye'. Representative Margalus. Margalus, 'aye'. Representative Henry, 'aye'. Huff, 'aye'. Daniels, Representative Daniels, what purpose do you rise?"

Daniels: "Can I be verified? I have a Conference Committee that's supposed to meet at 7:30."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan, could he be verified? No, he said no."

Daniels: "Mr. Ryan, please, Sir. Thank you. He said it's alright."

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't see him. Shake your head yes, George. Okay."

Daniels: "He's my leader."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Marovitz wishes to be verified....And Representative Matijevid, and

Representative Giorgi. They're all in the same Conference Committee. Proceed with the verification of the affirmative."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with a Poll of the Absentees. Schlickman, Sumner, Tuerk, Walsh, Willer, Winchester, and J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed with the affirmative votes."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Abramson, Ackerman, Anderson, Balanoff, Barnes, Beatty, Bell, Bianco, Birchler, Borchers, Boucek, Bower, Bowman, Bradley, Braun, Brummer, Bullock, Burnidge, Campbell, Capparelli, Catania, Christensen, Conti, Cullerton, Currie, Daniels, Darrow, Davis..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jake Wolf, for what purpose do you rise?"

Wolf: "Well, I guess this is a measure where you've either got to be fish or fowl, so vote me 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Wolf...J.J. Wolf, 'no'. Representative Alexander, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with a Poll of the Affirmative. Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Donovan, Doyle, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Flinn, Dwight Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin, Greiman, Griesheimer, Grossi, Hallock, Hanahan, Hannig, Harris, Henry, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Huff, Huskey, Jaffe, Johnson, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Keane, Kelly, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska, Kulas, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Madigan, Mahar, Margalus, Marovitz, Matijevich, Matula, Mautino, McAuliffe, McBroom, McClain, McGrew, McMaster, McPike, Meyer, Molloy,

Mulcahey, Murphy, Neff, Oblinger, O'Brien, Patrick, Pechous, Piel, Pierce, Polk, Pouncey, Preston, Rea, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Robbins, Ronan, Ropp, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Schuneman, Sharp, Simms..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ebbesen...Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this looks like a losing cause, and I will withdraw my request."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. Give me a count here, what have we got? Casey, 'aye'. There's 147 'ayes', and 12 'nos', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3046. Senate Bill 1644,...24, Karpziel. Representative Karpziel...Is she back there? There you are."

Karpziel: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although I am the Sponsor of this Bill, and I was not asked to ..had not seen a Conference Committee report before it was signed. I was not asked to sign it. Therefore, I am not too happy with it. And I do not agree with the Conference Committee report, but to save the time of this House, I will reluctantly ask this House to adopt Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1624 as amended."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further questions? Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt ...' Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, number one, I wonder if the Conference Committee report has been distributed? Number two, I wonder if the Sponsor could indicate what the original

Bill does and what the Conference Committee report does?"

Speaker Flinn: "It has been distributed. And the Sponsor will yield. Repre..."

Karpiel: "This is the ...This is for the appropriation for the Pollution Control Board."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further questions, Representative Brummer?"

Brummer: "We first had House Bill 1624 up there. Now we don't have any number up there. Is this a House or a Senate Bill?"

Karpiel: "This is a Senate Bill..."

Brummer: "We dumped House Bill 1624..."

Speaker Flinn: "It's Senate Bill, Representative.."

Karpiel: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Representative. It's Senate Bill 1624. I was the House Sponsor of it."

Brummer: "Okay. What does the Conference Committee report do in relationship to the original Bill?"

Karpiel: "Well, the original Bill took out the appropriations for two positions plus some money for court reporting and various other small amounts. The House put back in the appropriations for the two positions and the court reporting and now the ..the Senate has put back ..restored \$15,000 for one of the positions and \$10,000 for half of the court reporting."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I was supposed to be a Member of this Conference Committee. I'm going to vote 'no' on this and I'm going to tell

you why. There was no Conference Committee meeting. I was not advised of a Conference Committee meeting and I may well have supported this particular report. But I highly resent being a Member of a Conference Committee and not being apprised that it was going to meet and I don't think they ever did meet. They rolled it ahead and said there was some kind of agreement with the Director and from what I understand, somebody on the Senate staff called them and said you'll get one position. And if you don't take that, you won't get anything. And I think this is a step backwards. Those of you who have been around here for a few years remember that's how we used to have the Conference Committee reports. A few people would get together in the back room. They never would have a meeting. Shove something in front of you and ask you to sign it. I think it's a step backwards. I think it's a lousy way to run a House and I'm going to oppose it for that reason and that reason alone."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you. I have a question of the Clerk, I guess. I have two Conference Committee reports here for Senate Bill 1624. One has Mr. Wolf's name on it, but no signature. And the other one which says, 'revised printing', which is an interesting way to say that you've thrown away the first Conference Committee report and created another one out of whole cloth, does not have Representative Wolf's name on it and naturally does not also have his signature on it. Can you tell us what type of games are being played in the

Clerk's Office or wherever these games are being played?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, in the first place, if you are questioning the authenticity of the report, say so. If you're questioning the Clerk, you'd be out of order."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I'll ask the Speaker then. What kind of games are being played, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "What is the point of your..."

Skinner: "I have two Conference Committee reports. First Conference Committee report's on my desk. One says, 'First Conference Committee report' on Senate Bill 1624 as amended, June 30th, 1980. And it has on the House side conferees, Matijevich-Chapman-McClain-Wolf and Karpel. And then I have a 'First Conference Committee report' on Senate Bill 1626 June 30th, 1980. And on top it says, 'Revised printing' underlined with conferees from the House Matijevich-Chapman-Mautino-Peters and Abramson. Something is happening and I just would like a clue as to what it is. Different numbers. That'll do it everytime. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, the Clerk announced earlier the problem, Mr. Skinner. And he made the announcement here. And, your.. Well, that's right. Any further discussion? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like a ruling from the Parliamentarian please. Pursuant to Rule 68-A, can you tell me if the Conference Committee is in order, fourth line down on signature line?"

Speaker Flinn: "Would you state your problem there? There

are six signatures and they're all typewritten on the bottom of the report."

Piel: "Fourth signature down on the Senate side. That is not John Nimrod's signature. That is not John Nimrod's signature."

Speaker Flinn: "Apparently, Representative... I mean Senator Demuzio signed the wrong line. Should have signed the line above."

Piel: "That's all right. It's a violation of the rules then if he signed above John Nimrod's signature, correct?"

Speaker Flinn: "I think the rule is that as long as he signed the report..."

Piel: "I'm asking for a ruling from the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm giving it to you. The rule is as long as his name is typed in and he has signed the report."

Piel: "Okay. Always in the future we can all sign different lines, whichever one we want to."

Speaker Flinn: "The only purpose of the rule is so that the names be typed so that those whose signatures you cannot read, you can identify who is on the Committee. Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1624?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, in an era of environmental awareness, I don't think we should accede to the Dem..to the Senate Amendments, because quite frankly, they cut positions and if you cut positions you're cutting the number of enforcement cases and I'm sure in an era of citizen involvement in awareness of pollution control, that

the thing we don't want to do is hamstringing the enforcement mechanism of government and quite frankly a 'yes' vote will do this."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "In explaining my vote, I can remember when, I believe it was 1970, when we formed the Environmental Protection Agency and Pollution Control Board, when they had, I think it was 20 employees. They now have a brand new building and this is not the Pollution Control Board. This is just Environmental Protection Agency. They have now over 600 right here in Illinois. Anything we can do to hold them down, it's in the best interest of the people and the business of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 voting 'aye', 74 voting 'nay'. And the House does not adopt Conference Committee report #1. Representative Karpziel, do you request a second Conference Committee be appointed?"

Karpziel: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Flinn: "Request a second Conference Committee be appointed. Hearing no objections, it will be done. Yes? A little bit too late. Come down here and get on it.....Senate Bill 1510, Representative Collins. 1510."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to adopt ..."

Speaker Flinn: "Wait just a minute. I don't think...made a request. I think she probably ought to move to do not concur on that other Bill. Because it failed

to...Okay? It was Conference Committee report. Okay, Phil, you're on. Turn Phil on. Go ahead."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to adopt the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1510. This Bill as introduced and passed in both Houses would permit downship (sic), township...put downstate townships with populations in excess of 15,000 to nominate by primary election. This is an optional thing that is already enjoyed in Cook County. On the Bill, Representative Donovan attached an Amendment which I think is acceptable to everyone which would deal with filling a vacancy for township trustee. A third... A second Amendment Representative Conti offered which would delay certification of township assessors. This Amendment did cause some debate, so in Conference Committee, everything that I've just described was adopted in the Conference Committee except on the point of certification of township assessors. The delay would only pertain to Cook County. I would move for the acceptance of the Conference Committee report."

Speaker Plinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 to Senate Bill 1510?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 voting 'aye' and 6 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1510. House Bill 3487, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to ..that the House adopt the Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3487. It was signed off by all ten Members of the Conference Committee report (sic). I know of no opposition. Basically the added language, it amends the statute to comply with .. it amends the present statute so that we have statutorily complied with two appropriations items that have already been passed and sent to the Governor. It's the statutory language that approves the appropriation."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Stearney: "Does this deal with the Medical Center Commission in Chicago?"

McPike: "Yes. It keeps that.. yeah, it keeps that intact. We concur with Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2."

Stearney: "Is Senator D'Arco in the Conference Committee?"

McPike: "Yes."

Stearney: "Did he sign that report?"

McPike: "Yes."

Stearney: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the...Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I think that you should know that the items that the Gentleman is referring to which he did not mention in specific, are for the Department of Agriculture for soil surveys and soil and water conservation purposes and for the Department of Agriculture for grants to the city of Chicago for

conducting the Chicago 'fest'. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, Representative McPike to close. Oh, I'm sorry. Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, I just wanted to comment. Yes, that does contain that language which as a matter of fact there was a point I had made in Committee whether or not under the statutes that it was authorized to make that payment to the Chicago Fest. This would clarify and make it clear that it would be and also as you may recall, I placed an Amendment on another Bill which would have the Chicago Fest make an accounting to the Department as every other county fair does. And I support the Conference Committee report."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3487?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McPike?"

McPike: "Well, just briefly to explain my vote. This is nothing that the General Assembly has not done in the past. We've funded the Chicago Fest last year. It was simply a question as to whether or not this could be allowed under existing language and similar for downstate for those of you downstate that are voting against..voting against this. We are simply adding to the agricultural premium fund the fact that we can pay for soil and water conservation surveys. And all the rural districts in downstate Illinois have requested that we do this. And it's simply in statutory language to authorize it. The money is already

included in the budget. This is something that the downstate districts have asked us to do. And the Department of Agriculture is in agreement with it and as far as including the Chicago Fest, it is already on the Governor's desk and it will probably be signed and it was signed last year. This is nothing we haven't done in the past."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Preston. Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote on this. This contains an appropriation for Chicago..."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'nay'. And this Bill, having received the...rather the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3487. House Bill 1010, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1010 is the Bill that gives the public authorities more control over individuals who have been found not guilty by reason of insanity, not guilty of having committed a crime even though the individual that they hurt, was hurt, but it has to do with the insanity plea. Now the Conference Committee report, the Senate has receded from three Amendments that they put on it. Some slight additional changes have been made, brought about as a result of a few court decisions. In general what the Bill does is to have a slightly lesser standard in the case of individuals found not guilty by reason of insanity, permitting a court either to..if the individual would

be a threat to himself or others, to keep the person locked up in an institution where.. he won't hurt anyone or, in other situations, require the individual to be hospitalized or to have out-patient services. It is definitely a significant step in terms of dealing with people who commit crimes, the 'vandal' type of crimes and who are found not guilty by reason of insanity. And I would urge the adoption of the Conference Committee report on House Bill 1010."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House...Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to question the Gentleman if I may?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will yield."

Mautino: "Representative Katz, if I remember, this Bill goes back from about 1979. Wasn't this one of the earlier Bills that was presented to this General Assembly?"

Katz: "I think that it stayed over from last year, that is correct. The Senate added three Amendments to it, Mr. Mautino, which changed the nature of the Bill. And the Senate has now decided to recede from those Amendments. It was passed at the last Session, last year."

Mautino: "I do not have the Bill in front of me as amended. But if I remember correctly, that was a statement in there that was... that there was a technical Amendment changing, 'not guilty by reason of insanity,' from, 'guilty by reason of insanity.' That was originally brought about from the 'Delev-Wantase' case in Bureau County, and most recently in Indiana with the Lyman

Bostick case. It is my feeling that if this Bill is presented as it is that we are once again instituting innocence by reason of insanity rather than what some of us believe should be included, which is guilty but insane or guilty by reason of insanity. Is that the situation we're looking at right now?"

Katz: "What the Bill does, Mr. Mautino, is to go one step beyond the present law in terms of being able to control people who commit crimes and are found not guilty by reason of insanity, but it does not eliminate the insanity defense. Only one state has done that, I think, that's Michigan. But it is definitely a way of improving the control over those individuals who commit crimes while they are insane. So it's a step along the way in terms of giving the public authorities the power to deal with people who are found not guilty by reason of insanity. It does not create any new category like, guilty but insane or otherwise. There is such a thing done in the State of Michigan. It's a new law and I don't know how it's going to work out. But if you believe that there is not enough control over people who commit crimes while insane, you would be in favor of this Bill because it increases the control over such individuals."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Representative Katz. I don't think you answered my question. My question was..."

Katz: "I thought I had."

Mautino: "...Is this in fact, changing that so-called technical error back to not guilty by reason of insanity, when in fact it is drafted as guilty by

reason of insanity?"

Katz: "Representative Mautino, the mistake in drafting that I think you referred to was caught in earlier phases. As this Bill is, it is technically correct. It's been studied. As far as I know it is technically correct. It does not create any guilty by reason of insane. It...and it is technically correct. And I'll be very happy to...you can point to anything in it, but the...the error that you pointed out pointed so correctly about six or seven or eight months ago, whenever it was up, was corrected at an earlier phase."

Mautino: "Representative Katz, my question is, is it the intent of this Conference Committee report to include into our statutes a provision which was changed and so-called a technicality, drafting error? If that is the case, I'd like to have you tell me if I'm going to vote for a Bill that authorizes guilty by reason of insanity, or if I'm going to vote for a Bill that says guilty not by reason of insanity, which I..I'm assuming that many of the people in this General Assembly do support...the provisions for guilty by reason of insanity."

Katz: "Representative Mautino, this Bill continues the present law which is, that if an individual can be found not guilty by reason of insanity. The Gacy case in Chicago was such a case. If does not change the plea of not guilty by reason of insanity. What the Bill does, it says that if an individual is, in fact, acquitted because he was found not guilty by reason of insanity the court can still keep that individual in a

mental institution so that he doesn't commit a harm to any other individual or to himself. It does not change the plea of not guilty by reason of insanity. But it gives the court, and it gives the public authorities additional control over those individuals who are so acquitted. I think I've tried to answer your question. I don't understand why you keep telling me I haven't answered it."

Mautino: "Well, that's because I'm not an attorney, Representative Katz. Well, then I would like to address the Bill, if I may? I find it very difficult in this day and age to support a Conference Committee that is supposed to clean up some language. What we have before us is a Conference Committee, I believe, that says a person may murder somewhere else and have been found innocent by reason of insanity. And then, through the court system and not through the...or, through the mental health system and through the judicial system, can then be put back into society. I find that to be a very difficult pill to swallow. I would hope that fair minds would prevail and maybe we would adopt what they did in Indiana which would, I believe, has been guilty but insane. I find it very difficult to allow. And I think it has happened in the 'Bostick' case. I think to allow that we have convicted murderers, under the provisions of not guilty by reason of insanity, back on the streets. And I can't find any... any reason for it."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sam Wolf."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. So the Sponsor, Representative Katz, is recognized to close."

Katz: "If you believe that the courts have been too lenient in permitting people who have committed crimes to go back on the street when they are found not guilty by reason of insanity, then you will vote for this Bill. Because this gives the courts more control over individuals who commit crimes and are acquitted by reason of insanity. And so, this is a Bill that, I would think, Mr. Mautino and all of you who believe in protecting people from insane individuals would very strongly vote for."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 1010? All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. And Representative Abramson is recognized to explain his vote."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. The way the Bill is drafted, it requires that a person being acquitted by reason of insanity is sentenced for an indefinite period of time and the maximum time being the maximum length of sentence that he could have gotten under...being convicted. Okay, this way, if someone is convicted of a Class X felony, they get only about six years, could end up spending three years in a mental institution for the crime and be found guilty

by reason of insanity. I think it would be much more reasonable to go with...with the other method of finding a person guilty but insane."

Speaker Flinn: "The camera lights were out. We're explaining votes. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote. I think Representative Mautino, in his statement, may have misunderstood the real thrust of this Bill in protecting society and protecting people.

He raises the question that we ought to have another finding. I think he's referring to guilty, but mentally ill. That's a different subject matter. That's something that the Legislature might continue to consider. Right now what we're talking about is protecting people from premature release, without proper court supervision, of people who have committed a murder and been found not guilty by reason of insanity. And then find that they are subsequently released far too soon, without proper security, without proper guards, without proper court supervision. This Bill will go far to protect society from that sort of abuse. That's why we need it, regardless of the additional question raised by Representative Mautino when he suggests we ought to consider another finding."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 1010. Senate Bill 1760. Representative John Dunn. Representative Darrow,

would you sit down?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1760 makes no change in the substance of the Bill. There is a technical change in the Amendment which was adopted in the House which affects the time of notice and it is a routine mechanical Amendment. And I would ask for approval of the Conference Committee report #1 to Senate Bill 1760."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption. Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1760?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 voting 'aye' and 1 voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1760. House Bill 2823, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2823 is a Bill that allows delayed payments on inheritance tax on closely held businesses and farms. A Senate Amendment was placed on the Bill, Senate Amendment 6, that was not needed because it was contained in other legislation already sent to the Governor. The Senate Sponsor of that Amendment was to recede from the Amendment, but somehow he got his signals mixed and he refused to recede which sent this matter to a Conference Committee. The Conference Committee recommends that the Senate do recede from Amendment..Senate Amendment 6. That would leave the Bill just as the House

finally approved it and would send the Bill to the Governor in proper form. I, therefore, move that Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 2823 be approved."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, every once in a while something comes up in the House Republican staff analyses which tickles my funnybone. And analyst Rick Larison has come up with a comment on this one that really should be shared. He comments, 'The Senate did not recede from Amendment 6 originally due to general confusion on the issue'."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion?"

Pierce: "Well, what's so unusual about that?"

Skinner: "Maybe nothing."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 2823?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'."

Pierce: "'Aye', all good citizens vote 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 voting 'aye' and none voting 'nay'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 2823. Senate Bill 1635, Representative Robbins. Pullen, Pullen is on deck. So we know...So somebody knows where she's at."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we accept the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1635. The Senate concurred in House Amendments 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 22 and asks the

House recede on 1, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 21."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we don't need the Senate Amendment numbers. All we need is to adopt the Conference Committee report. That would...."

Robbins: "I move that we adopt the Conference Committee report."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House adopt the Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1635 and on that, Representative Slape."

Slape: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Slape: "Clyde, just exactly what are we taking out of the Bill by receding from those Amendments?"

Robbins: "We are taking six positions out of the Bill, a poultry show, a Latin American market study, a vocational alcohol fuel program, a shopping center in East Garfield, a study for a baseball park in Peoria, a two million for crisis and day care center, and a two hundred thousand dollar local government finance study commission. This is on another Bill."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, could you bring the House to order please? Mr. Speaker? Quiet them down a little bit."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Let's have a little order please."

Slape: "Just exactly what's left in the appropriation then, Clyde?"

Robbins: "The state fair operations, the ag premium fund for county fairs, 4-H and FFA, state fair fire protection, five hundred thousand grant for Chicago Fest, twelve hundred and seventy dollars for replacing snow damage to Will County Fair and restoration of hundred thousand dollars to the Natural Resources Division and

two positions in regulatory compliance provision."

Slape: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House ...' Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Does this Bill still contain the appropriation of five hundred thousand dollars from the agricultural premium fund for a grant to the city of Chicago for conducting Chicago Fest?"

Robbins: "Amendment #10 should be on your desk. Yes."

Schlickman: "Does this Bill still..."

Robbins: "No. No, that's ... Amendment #10 requires that accounting of this money should be done. It does not contain that appropriation."

Schlickman: "Well, Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill (sic) 1634 (sic) contained a five hundred thousand dollar grant to the city of Chicago for conducting Chicago Fest. What happened to Senate Amendment #4?"

Robbins: "It's still in the Bill on Senate Amendment #4, yes."

Schlickman: "All right. Does this Bill still contain House Amendment #4 appropriating thirty thousand from agriculture premium fund for the Waukegan Lake Front Festival?"

Robbins: "Yes, it's still in the Bill."

Schlickman: "What is the philosophy that supports diverting from the agricultural premium fund money for urban extravaganzas?"

Robbins: "The Chicago Fest was put in because they had no major fair. It was considered something that the

people of Chicago was for and on number 4 I would like to refer to John Matijeovich to explain."

Schlickman: "Well, let me continue this. The village of Arlington Heights has annually Frontier Days. By your philosophy, it would be appropriate inasmuch as Arlington Heights doesn't have a state fair, a county fair, or a municipal fair, that it ought to have the right to come to the State Legislature and further deplete the agricultural premium fund by securing a grant to support those Frontier Days. Is that correct?"

Robbins: "I am Sponsor of the Bill. I do not necessarily have to agree with everything that is in any Bill that I'm Sponsor of. You've been around enough to know that. And if you remember, the other day whenever we were talking about all the goodies being put on that Bill, I suggested that if you wanted to try that, that was your prerogative. I think the Conference Committee should knock more of them out than what they do."

Schlickman: "May I address myself to the Conference Committee report, Mr. Speaker? May I address myself to the Conference Committee report?"

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed, please."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're talking about the appropriation of state money and I think we have to be talking about philosophy with respect to the expenditure of money. And there ought to be an end or an objective with respect to the expenditure of money. Now, I'm not too familiar with the agricultural premium fund. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the end, the goal,

the objective of the agricultural premium fund is to promote agriculture, which is a prime industry in the state. And I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we ought not to be corrupting, to depleting that fund for other purposes unrelated to agriculture. And, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, by accepting this Conference Committee report, which includes thirty thousand dollars for the Waukegan Lakefront Festival, which includes one-half million dollars for Chicago Fest, neither of which fit within a state program, fit within a state philosophy we are establishing a precedent that will enable every unit of local government, whether it be a Park District, a municipality, whatever you may have, to come to this Legislature and ask for a grant from the agricultural premium fund. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we ought to close the spigot, we ought not to allow for this kind of misappropriation to incur unless we have deliberately in a sound fashion determined that it is sound public policy, it's in the best interest of the state to make grants. And if we do that, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, why don't we set up another fund for festivals for fests? I respectfully suggest a 'nay' vote on this Conference Committee report. Send it back to a second Conference Committee and let's take out all of those items that are not related to agriculture. I urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Sponsor is recognized to close. Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Conference Committee report includes most of things which the Department of Agriculture wanted. There are a couple of things which were brought on out by this Chicago Fest. It was funded by..in the same way last year. This House moved to fund it last year. The precedent was set so I.. I suggest an 'aye' vote on this and if we want to take it out next year, take it out on the floor of the House before we get to Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report on Senate..#1 on Senate Bill 1635?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. And Representative Preston is recognized to explain his vote and the camera lights are out."

Preston: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Conference Committee report contains a half a million dollar appropriation for Chicago Fest this summer. There have been people in Chicago who have applied to be concessionaires to Chicago Fest, some one year ago or more. Many of these people have not been contacted by the Committee. They have not been contacted to find out, in fact what kind of a concession they want to run in Chicago Fest."

There's been more than hints of fraud to the letting of concessions where there's been some hint that people responsible for letting of those concessions, in fact, have a piece of the concessions that they're giving permission to run at Chicago Fest. If Chicago cannot deal fairly with the people, if they can't adequately execute and administer Chicago Fest, they ought not be in the business of giving these giant festivals and I am therefore voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, most of the discussion is centered around the Fest. I wanted to ask the Sponsor what the rationale was in excising that very important Amendment #18, which was for planning for expansion of grandstand and so forth in the Heart of Illinois Fair? I think it was a very important Amendment. I don't think that the Committee was advised. In fact, they were ill-advised by arbitrarily excising that from the Bill. And therefore, I cast a negative vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hate to allow principle to overcome personal greed in pork barrel, but as you all know, I believe I'm the only Legislator that represents the city of Waukegan as a resident from that city. You'll have a new one next Session. But I think it's about time that somebody stands up and says, 'Don't give us the money.' Waukegan shouldn't have this money. This is not what the money in the Department of Agriculture should be used for. What the people of Waukegan want is lower taxes and

you're giving away their taxes for a very few who enjoy the Lakefront Festival in Waukegan. Many of you have been there by the invitation of the city when we had the outing four years ago and two years ago. We have fine waterfront. You, indeed, are invited back there. But let's not use state money in a give away program. Next year many of you will be back saying, 'Let's have it for Carbondale, Charleston, Joliet, ect.' We all have good festivals and this is not what our money is supposed to be used for. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am for fests as you know, because I believe that tourism helps the economy of Illinois. But I also want to remind you that there is a tourism promotion fund where these same fests can apply for matching funds. The trouble is they don't want to go through it that way because they want an out and out grant. We do not give out and out grants. We must have the funds from the community, a 60-40 match. So this is the reason that I will be voting 'no' on this Conference Committee because I do believe that those two fests should be removed."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the only thing I'd like to say is I certainly would like to support the Agriculture Department budget because I know of the importance that it plays throughout the state in many of the programs. However, I think, again we're sitting a real bad precedent here by permitting additional outside groups to come in and deplete that

particular budget. I guess the only thing I can say is I could hardly wait and I hope that I'm here long enough to be Chairman of the Appropriation Committee and get this gift. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as far as I can tell, Amendment 10 simply requires Chicago to report how the five hundred thousand dollars Chicago Fest grant is spent and the money is not in this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this ...On this question there are 93 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'nay' and Representative Preston has already requested a verification. Representative Jake Wolf. Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Chairman (sic), Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified? I have to go to Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Representative Preston, Jake Wolf wants leave to be verified. Representative Katz wants leave to be verified. Both verified. You want to poll the absentees. We'll begin by polling the absentees at the request of Representative Robbins."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bluthardt. Bradley. Deuster. Epton. Henry. Huff. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. McAuliffe. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Slape..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stearney. Stearney, 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Change Mulcahey from 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees; VonBoeckman. Walsh. Watson. Younge. And, Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "Are there any further changes before we poll the affirmative? We're starting off with 95, I take it, Mr. Clerk. 95 'ayes', Mr. Preston. Verify the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson...."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McMaster votes 'aye'. Representative Karpiel votes 'aye'. Representative Preston, we're starting with 97." Preston: "Sir, did you say 97?"

Speaker Flinn: "97. Watson 'aye'. 98. Hallock 'aye'. 99. Any further? Proceed with the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Balanoff. Barnes. Borchers. Bower. Bullock. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Chapman. Christensen. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schlickman, Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I think we're entitled to the courtesy of having everyone in their seat and raising their arm when their name is called, please."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. Would the House come to order and each of the Members be in their seat? And those who are not entitled to the floor, please leave. They are entitled to see whether or not the Members are here. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Walsh, you have been personally requested to sit down by your neighbor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle.

Ralph Dunn. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa..."

Speaker Flinn: "Bullock wants to vote 'aye'.. 'no'. Change him from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Stiehl, Cissy Stiehl."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Change C.M. Stiehl from 'no' to 'aye'. I recognized her first. She's an 'aye' vote, yes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative: Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huskey. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Karpel. Katz..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise? Collins, 'aye'. Representative Walsh, you wanted to vote 'aye' on this I understand? Walsh, 'aye'. That's 101 'ayes'. Do we have leave to have Representative Ryan, Matijevich, McClain, Chapman and Wolf, J.J., that is, verified? They're in a Conference Committee. If we don't have leave, we've got to call them right now. They have leave? Leave. They are Ryan, Matijevich, McClain, Chapman and Wolf, J.J., that is. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Keane. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. .."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'yes' please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Change her from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker, however I was recorded, it was in error. I do want to vote an 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pechous votes 'aye' and that's 103 we stand at now. Representative Wikoff, 'aye'. Representative Kent. Kent."

Kent: "Inasmuch as I want to be sure that the ag fund is passed, I will be changing my vote to 'aye', but I'm not changing my idea of where they should get their money."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McBroom wants to be verified. Representative Preston, okay? We now have 105. Representative VonBoeckman wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. 106. Jesse White wants to go 'aye'. That's 107. Representative Preston, do you persist in your ... Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kulas..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Christensen? He wants to be verified. He's verified. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Lechowicz. Leon..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dwight Friedrich votes 'aye'. Williamson, 'aye'. For Williamson. Beatty votes 'aye'. Representative Kornowicz wants to be verified. Okay, Representative Preston? We have 110 'aye'. You still persist I take it? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leverenz. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McBroom...."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Keane wishes to be verified. Cissy Stiehl verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Pierce. .."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative J. David Jones."

Representative Jones wishes to be verified. Okay?
Okay, he's verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pouncey. Rea. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins.
Ronan. Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler.
Schneider. Sharp. Simms. Stearney. Steczko.
E.G.Steele. C.M. Stiehl..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Greiman wishes to be
verified. Representative Ben Polk wishes to be..vote
'aye' and be verified. Change Polk from 'no' to
'aye'. Representative Preston you now have over 111
'ayes'. Representative Stuffle wishes to vote 'aye'.
Change him from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative
Bradley. Change him from not voting to 'no'.
Representative Ebbesen wishes to vote 'aye'.
Representative Taylor wishes to be verified. Taylor,
verified. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time, I will not
persist with verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Thank you very much. The Gentleman
withdraws his verification. On this question there
are 113 voting 'aye', and 54 voting 'no'. And the
House does adopt Conference Committee #1 on Senate
Bill 1635. On Supplemental Calendar #4, we're going
to do the Nonconcurrences so we can get busy to
appoint another Conference Committee on those and so
the first one is Senate Bill 569. Representative
Hoffman. Is Representative Gene Hoffman here? Take
that out of the record momentarily. How about 1640?
Representative Ewing? Representative Ewing on
Nonconcurrency motion."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I think the right motion is I refuse to

recede.. move that we refuse to recede from these Amendments and I ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that we do not..the House do not concur ..refuse to recede, rather, from the House Amendments 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7. Any discussion? If not, all those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 1640. And a Conference Committee is requested, I think...will be appointed. Senate Bill 1710, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I would also move to ask for a Conference Committee report so we recede...do not recede from Representative Murphy's Amendment we put on in the House before. And I'd ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that we do not recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1710 and a Conference Committee be appointed. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. And the 'ayes' have it. 1713, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "I would like to keep from receding on this one. This is Representative Anderson's Amendment we put on, was an overwhelming vote and I'd ask for a Conference Committee on that as well."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1713. And a Conference Committee be appointed. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And it is so ordered. House Bill 3432,

Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3432 relates to parent fees in the Department of Children and Family Services and passed this House with 125 votes. There were technical problems with the Bill and with the Senate Amendment concerning some spellings that were wrong and concerning the filling out of the 'Feeley Reimbursement Table'. This Conference Committee is completely noncontroversial and I urge its adoption by the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, could you adjust the Board so it says Conference Committee report?"

Speaker Flinn: "This is not a Nonconcurrency. It's a Conference Committee report. It's number one, right? Put a one up there too, Jack. Okay. Any further discussion? The question is...The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3432?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Mulcahey's on deck. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record...."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "On this question there are 130 'ayes', 9 voting 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3432. Mark Simms 'aye' on that last vote. Senate Bill 1404. Representative Mulcahey. Representative Brummer is on deck, incidently."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that

we adopt Conference Committee report #1 to Senate Bill 1404. Originally it did pass the Senate 47 to 6. It passed the House 150 to 9. Some changes were made in it to make the Bill stronger and simply indicated that municipalities without a chlorination system first of all, shall install a standby chlorination system at their own expense. And secondly, that municipalities of subdivisions will make regular..this was not in the Bill. This came as a result of the report...will make regular inspections and have water samples taken three times weekly, which is even more than the EPA does themselves. And currently, only the state EPA may test water samples. But these communities under 5,000 that do decide by referendum to go to this particular method, will be mandated to do this three times weekly along with the regular state EPA tests. As I indicated, it passed the Senate 47-6 and the House 150 to 9. And I would ask the adoption of Conference Committee report #1 to Senate Bill 1404."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House concur ..adopt rather, Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1404?' 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 139 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'nay'. And the House does concur in Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1404. House Bill 3179, Representative Brummer. And Representative Davis is on deck. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House."

House Bill 3179 in its original form established the Medical Service Facility Revenue Bond Act authorizing municipalities or counties to issue revenue bonds to provide medical and dental offices or clinics. That Bill passed the House previously here with 128 votes. In the Senate, Senate Amendment was added which incorporated the provisions of House Bill 3357 which had been sponsored in the House by Representative Rigney, establishing Ambulance Districts. That Bill had previously passed the House 119..with 119 votes. When the Bill came back from the Senate with that on, and I was going to move for concurrence and we were examining the language in the Bill, there were some technical errors in that it did not comply with the consolidation of elections. There were several other minor technical errors. We decided to send it back to Conference Committee to simply clean up those technical errors and I would move for the adoption of Conference Committee report #1. The Senate has already adopted that Conference Committee report with 56 affirmative votes."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would urge a 'nay' vote if, for no other reason than the fact that the State of Illinois has more units of government, local government, per capita than any other state in the country. And by this Conference Committee report, we are creating another unit of local government, Hospital Districts. I can't believe, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that to

provide for the public safety, welfare morals of this state that we have to engage in the creation of more units of local government. Seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have enough government at the local level. Let's just use it better, rather than compounding the situation by creating more to the detriment of the taxpayers of this state. I urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Mr. Brummer to close."

Brummer: "Yes. As I indicated this is a front door referendum provision with regard to the items that Representative Schlickman was talking about incorporating the provisions of Harlan Rigney's Bill that previously passed here with 120..119 affirmative votes. The Senate has already adopted this Conference Committee report with 56 affirmative votes. I would urge that we do likewise."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3179?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'ayes', 21 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3179. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 185. Senate Bill 185, Mr. Davis. Clerk, read the report. It's on Supplemental #3 on House Calendar #3. 185."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 185, a second Conference

Committee revised printing."

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

Johnson: "Well, point of order..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point?"

Johnson: "Parliamentary inquiry; the original revised second Conference Committee report had totally different or almost totally different House Members than this revised second Conference Committee report does. How did that happen?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It always happens."

Johnson: "Well, can you give me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On second Conference Committee report it's up to the Speaker and the Minority Leader to select the Membership."

Johnson: "Well, I understand..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, Speaker is absolutely right. It always happens. Ladies and Gentleman, I would move to adopt the second Conference Committee report revised of Senate Bill 185, which was an omnibus crime Bill earlier on, and now has been modified severely to include two items of business. First item of business, a very good item, which will increase the penalty for possession of bombs, knives, gasoline, weapons of that sort within a penal institution from what it currently is to a Class 1 felony. It's a very good Bill. Second item of the Conference Committee report that's in there is a new Act creating the act of threatening a public official, which carries a penalty of a Class 4 felony and would allow the

Department of Law Enforcement upon receipt of a public official and they're only constitutional officers, upon receipt of a threat from someone in the State of Illinois to go to the Department of Mental Health to check out the person's mental stability through examining or requesting examination of limited information of mental health records. That's what it does and I would respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

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

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Stearney: "Representative, when this..this Bill regarding possession of weapons came..was passed out of Committee in 1979, am I right?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Stearney: "And the House passed that Bill by 134 to 4. Am I right?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Stearney: "And then it went into Conference Committee. Am I right?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Stearney: "And then the Conference Committee report failed with only 51 votes on July 1st, 1979. Am I right?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

Stearney: "So, obviously this first provision relative to possession of weapons was really not that important to the Senate Sponsor that it be passed immediately as of last year. Am I right?"

Davis: "May I qualify my answer?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Davis: "Well, you're absolutely right, Representative Stearney, except for one thing. The Bill did not receive a sufficient number of votes to pass it last June simply because it contained a very onerous provision that's been removed that dealt with a certified public accountant and reporting tax evasion kinds of things."

Stearney: "Yeah, but my point is this, that nobody really considered the possession of weapons, provision to be so important that you could afford to delay its enactment into law."

Davis: "Well, apparently, that's the case."

Stearney: "So, really, then, we could live without that provision for another year then I would take it."

Davis: "The possession of weapons?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Davis: "Oh, no, Sir. That's the very heart of the Bill, the very key..."

Stearney: "Well, you could have passed it last year without putting this into Conference Committee and attaching a great number of other matters to it. That's my point."

Davis: "Well, there's only one Member of the Conference Committee...the will of the Committee was that other things be included."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me call your attention to a very significant piece of legislation here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Stearney: "And I think all Members should pay some attention because this matter was soundly defeated last year on

the matter of the issue of threatening public officials. This was an attempt last year by the Members of the Governor's Office to protect each and every one of us, all of the elected officials in the State of Illinois as mentioned in the State Constitution, on down to the county assessor. Well, when that matter attracted so much opposition, then they refined it down and it seems to be an attempt by the Department of Law Enforcement to gain a small foothold. Now, what it does is simply say that an individual who sends a letter of writing or anything to the Governor or someone else in which he threatens him, not even affecting his public performance in his duties, is nevertheless subject to a Class 4 felony. Well, let me say this here and it was brought out in Conference Committee yesterday...that the Governor's man has said he was really interested in obtaining information from the mental institutions as to whether an individual who sent a letter, an inmate, is really dangerous or not. And I said to him, well, would you be willing to take that Section alone? And he says, oh, no, my God. I need the entire provision creating an entire new crime of threatening a public official. Well, I say to you and it's been said before, that there is already in the Criminal Code, Chapter 38, Section 12-6, the crime of intimidation which is a Class 3 felony which is even more severe as the one posed. And it says, and I quote to you, 'A person commits intimidation when; when intent to cause another to perform or to admit to the performance of any act, he communicates to another a threat to

perform without lawful authority any of the following acts; namely, inflict physical harm.' Now, I say to you, the provision is already covered in the Criminal Code. Now, mind you, and they can also charge an individual with attempt to aggravate a battery, and attempt murder. But really now, what is the guise? What is the attempt by Members of the Governor's Office and the Gentleman is walking down the aisle there, seeking to lobby his last vote, is the set up a little.. mini-secret service here, a little Gestapo agency under the guise of protecting us all? But we all remember J. Edgar Hoover under his guise of protecting every individual that he compiled dossiers of every Member of the House and the Senate in Congress and then again, he never lost a vote on every measure he was concerned with. This is an attempt to garner power by the Department of Law Enforcement when they don't need it. There was already existing Statutes, existing legislation, to protect those very same individuals. But, yes, they come back over and over and over with this very same Bill and I ask why. And they have no reason, at least they don't want to tell us the reason. But I say to you, if we're against this fascist type mentality of people in this office, this Gestapo attitude, they don't need this particular provision because it's already covered by law. Threatening public officials is a sham. It's a fraud. And we don't need it and again we should defeat this particular measure. If they were so interested in the original Bill, that I voted for in Committee, they could have passed it as we did pass it

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

out at 134 to nothing and have it enacted into law as of last year. But no, they decided not to because they wanted more. They wanted this provision..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly bring your remarks to a close."

Stearney: "So I say they should get nothing because this is an attempt to defraud, to deceive. We should defeat this as we defeated this last year and send them back. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer. Brummer? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "State your point, Sir."

Mugalian: "My point is that I have before me something that's called, 'Second Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 185, parenthesis, revised, parenthesis.' Then, marked over that, in a different kind of large type is 'revised printing.' Then I find another pink sheet of paper .."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mugalian, we'll have the Clerk explain that to you. Mr. O'Brien. He explained it earlier."

Clerk O'Brien: "On the revised printing, we had printed three Conference Committees, but in the print shop, page ...the pages following page one became mixed up. We reprinted all three of the Conference Committees and marked them, 'revised printing'."

Mugalian: "Yes, but they're entirely different people on the two reports. How do you explain that? That would indicate that a third Conference Committee was

appointed."

Clerk O'Brien: "The only thing we had correct was the front page. If you look at the signature page, there's a different LRB number which indicates it was to a different Conference Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we take this out of the record until we get that straightened out? No? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1728. Mr. Watson. Mr. Watson?"

Watson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk, read the Bill. 1728, nonconcurrence. Page four of the Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1728, on Nonconcurrence, a Bill for an Act in relation to exemptions in bankruptcy proceedings."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to recede from House Amendments 1, 8 and 9 to Senate Bill 1728. This is a Bill that opts Illinois out of the federal exemptions in the Federal Bankruptcy Act of 1978. This Bill has been debated several times on the House floor. I don't believe I need to go into the merits of the legislation at this time. The Amendments I agreed to when they were placed on the Senate Bill went over to the Senate. Senator Weaver at that time agreed to concur with those Amendments and we both worked very hard for the passage and concurrence in the Senate. However, the Senate did not concur and therefore we have the Senate Bill 1728 back with us. I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr.

Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I urge a 'nay' vote on this motion to recede. And I think in considering the motion to recede, consider the fact that we're dealing with the subject of bankruptcy. A form of relief to beleaguered individuals in this state and the nation as a whole who have found themselves generally speaking in a dire situation through no fault of their own subjected to ignorance, subjected to the unscrupulous practices of some creditors. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a number of years ago, the Federal Government constitutionally determined that individuals ought to have a second chance. They ought to have the chance to take themselves out of a situation almost akin to slavery, not being free people. Now the Congress initially allowed the states to determine which exemption the bankrupt could avail himself or herself of. Well, we found, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, under a federal law a variety of exemptions depending on the tradition, depending on the customs within each of the states. Somewhat of anomaly, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when you consider the federal law is intended to apply uniformly among the 50 states. What the Congress did, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, last year was to up-date, was to reform the Bankruptcy Act. And in doing so, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it took into account the fact that there is a number of states that have not up-dated their exemptions for the benefit of debtors to allow them to have that free, fresh start.

And, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there is no one including the most avid proponent of this Bill that denies that Illinois is behind grossly with respect to these exemptions that are allowed to a bankrupt. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when this Bill allowing . . . or exercising the allowance that the Federal Government has given by compromise in Washington to opt out from the federal exemptions in favor of the state exemptions, when this Bill was heard in Committee it was acknowledged, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House that it was a half-hearted effort with respect to doing the job. It opts out . . . it opted out without up-dating the Illinois exemptions. And as a consequence, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill did not get the required number of votes to be reported out of Committee. Instead, subsequently, there was a motion to discharge and on the floor of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill himself agreed to certain up-dating with respect to the Illinois exemptions. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we can't accept a Bill allowing Illinois to opt out from the federal exemptions without up-dating the Illinois exemptions. It would be totally unfair. And it would be a response totally to the special interest groups within the state. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, for the sake of fairness, for the sake of bilateral response, I urge a 'nay' vote on this motion to recede. We ought not recede from the up-dating of the Illinois exemptions as they're contained in House Amendments. We aren't, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, going in the direction of establishing some

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

kind of uniformity among the states with respect to exemptions for bankrupts. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we ought to consider the other side of the coin, the consumer, the person who gives vitality to our economy and we ought to give to the consumer the opportunity of a fresh start. Let's not subject our consumers, our bankrupts in this state to the out-dated, out-moded and frankly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the very unfair exemptions that presently exist. If the Sponsors of this Bill don't want to up-date our exemptions, then dog gone it, let's go with the federal exemptions. I urge a 'nay' vote."

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

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this motion to recede. Representative Schlickman is absolutely correct. If you remember the debate on this Bill, this was...Our recession would take a horrible Bill and make it an absolute disaster. When the Bill passed the House, the Sponsor conceded that we had to up-date the exemptions. And if you recall, we put on only the Amendments that we possibly could. If you recall what did we put on in the House? We put on that an individual could take a \$750 interest in the tool for his trade. We put in that the.. that the debtor could have the professionally prescribed health aides for the debtor or debtor's family. So what we're saying if we recede is you know, don't let him keep his wooden leg. Don't let him keep his false teeth. Don't let him keep his glass eye. Don't let him keep his pacemaker. We're going to

take all those things away from a bankrupt because of the greedy people in this particular state. This is really the most regressive Bill that we have ever addressed in this General Assembly. I must tell you that no group really wants it. This is anti-single person because a single person does not have the same exemption as a married person under the Illinois law if we go back to what the Illinois was..law was. It's anti-small business. It's anti-farm. It's anti-labor. It's anti-people. It's anti-human race. The only ones that are pro on this Bill are the bloodsuckers, so if you want to be pro-bloodsucker, vote for the Amendment, but if you don't want to be pro-bloodsucker and if you want to vote for the single person, the small business person, the farm person, the labor person, then you vote 'no' on this particular recession motion and send it to a Conference Committee and let us work out something that's reasonable and decent."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Give the Gentleman your attention please. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rather say that this is a Bill not for the bloodsuckers, but to take care of the deadbeats in this world. Now, I can tell you, having had some experience in bankruptcy court, that the people go through bankruptcy are not those people that have ..you have been lead to believe are those that have been lead down the priurose path by people who have extended them credit far beyond their means. They're people because of greed or because they want to have everything have gone out on

a limb and sawed themselves off. And I can tell you that many, many people who go through bankruptcy court are not out on a limb. They have not sawed themselves out. However, they find it much more convenient, much more convenient to go through the wringer, go through bankruptcy to get rid of all of their debts rather than pay them. Because once they get rid of all their debts, they can keep their whole paycheck. They don't owe anybody any money. Now, if we don't pass this Bill and we adopt the federal standards which are so loose that you can have an estate of about \$50,000, net worth of about \$50,000, then what incentive is there to pay your bills? You can keep \$50,000. That's quite a grub steak. And believe me, most couples go through bankruptcy cause most of them are on the various notes of the family. And they certainly, every time a person goes through it'll be a couple from now on because they can double all of their exemptions. And the idea behind the exemptions is not to put a person out on the street if he goes bankrupt, not to make it very, very tough to go bankrupt. I can tell you, in this day and age people have a substantial equity in their house and this is a restraint on them going bankrupt. That means they may have to try to work out their bills and pay their creditors at least something. I can tell you that of all the individuals that go through bankruptcy, probably 99.999% have no assets to distribute to their creditors because of exemptions that now exist. The various referees in bankruptcy have always viewed the bankruptcy law and the exemptions extremely liberally

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

so that you can go through bankruptcy as painlessly as possible. If you give them this tool, and this is a tool for the unscrupulous referees who don't care about the creditors, then everybody can go through bankruptcy without having to lose anything. If you think people ought to be encouraged not to pay their bills, then vote against this motion. If you think people ought to pay their bills, then vote for it. And I can just tell you this, economically every person that doesn't pay their just bill, that gets passed off on those who do pay their bills in the form of higher prices. This is, in fact, a consumer measure to help keep prices down by keeping the deadbeats out of bankruptcy court. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I strongly urge a vote on the Gentleman's motion to recede from the Amendments."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a question? Mr. Watson, the three Amendments that you put on, which were based on your promise to put those Amendments on, one was to exempt the health aides or health devices. Is that correct?"

Watson: "That's right."

Greiman: "That a person might have...The other one was an amount up to \$750.00 for the tools of trade so that, for example, a carpenter wouldn't lose his tools. Is that right?"

Watson: "That's right."

Greiman: "Your answer is in the affirmative?"

Watson: "Yes."

Greiman: "And the other is, the other is, an increase from

\$300 for a person, that's a single person now, to \$2,000. Is that right?"

Watson: "Well, it was an increase from 300 for an individual, and a thousand for a head of a household to 2,000, yes."

Greiman: "Okay. And those were the only three that were put on and those are the three that you want to take off. Is that correct?"

Watson: "Well, I agree that they're good Amendments, but the problem.."

Greiman: "But those are the three that you're asking us to take off. Is that right?"

Watson: "Those are three I agreed to."

Greiman: "Thank you."

Watson: "Yes..."

Greiman: "On the Bill, Mr. Speaker, we have a motion before us to no longer make exempt health devices. A wooden leg I guess would now be exe.. you could execute on it. An iron lung you could take away under...if we recede from this. The tools of trade of a carpenter, of a plumber, of a workman, of a tile setter, working people, they would be taken away. And we would change the minimal amount that a person could hold. Now, I don't necessarily agree with all the speakers even on my side who have spoken. I think we're talking about a lot of extremes. The truth is that the people, the people who will be going through bankruptcy in the months to come in this country, they will be the people who work for Wisconsin Steel, for example, who are going to be unemployed or under employed, the people who are working for those Chrysler plants that

might close, the people who are working for a hundred businesses. And I might tell you that normally the very poor don't have the kind of exemptions we're talking about. So that this Bill if we recede takes away rights from the middle class, from the small businessman, who no longer can keep his business afloat. My friends, this is against the small businessman, let me tell you. We have had no opportunity to investigate what the impact of the Federal Act is. We want that opportunity. But even without it, we would be willing to go through a Conference Committee, to discuss this issue, to make sure that there are some sensible exemptions. We have plenty of time because I believe, I believe that we can agree. Give us the chance to go to Conference Committee and vote 'no' on this. My friends, Dickens begins the Tale of Two Cities with the words, 'It was the best of times; it was the worst of times'. For most of the men and women in this room it is now the best of times. But for millions of Americans in the days to come in this country, it may for them be the worst of times. Men and women who have built equities in homes, have a car with a little equity, have some tools with an equity, have a wooden leg with a little equity, for them, for them, it is the worst of times. And I think that it would be a shame for the Illinois General Assembly to read the financial pages and to find that we are in a deep recession or depression and to say, 'We, in the Illinois General Assembly, we will meet our responsibilities of these people by taking their exemptions away, by making them

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

even more impoverished. Vote 'no'. Let us go to Conference Committee."

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

Boucek: "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. Mr. Watson to close."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this Bill was passed in Congress of 1978, they gave the states the rights to opt out. Twelve states have done this so far. I, personally, feel that we, here in Illinois, can decide what we think is best for the people of Illinois. We don't need the Federal Government telling us what to do. We have a choice now of liberal exemptions and by liberal, let me just go over two of them that I think you'll have to agree with me are quite liberal. Any and all household furnishings, goods, clothes, appliances, books, clocks, musical instruments, up to a value of \$200.00 for any particular item. That's any and all. Up to \$400.00 in property which may be combined with an unclaimed homestead exemption which could be a maximum of \$11,500. That's in personal property. That could be stocks, bonds, savings accounts, checking accounts, whatever. \$7500 of a debtor's interest in a homestead. If it's a married couple, it could be \$15,000, and if they so wish, they can take the state exemption and the federal exemption and come up with \$17,500 in an exemption in the.. in a home. Bankruptcy should be something only as a last resort. It shouldn't be encouraged and I think by

having the federal exemptions that we do provides that encouragement. I would appreciate support for my motion and a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments.. House Amendments 1, 8 and 9 to Senate Bill 1728?' All in favor vote 'aye'...What's the question? To recede from Amendments 1, 8 and 9 on Senate Bill 1728? All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I really wanted to ask the Sponsor a question. Would he yield? Representative Watson around? I really wanted to ask the Sponsor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir. Mr. Watson? Please proceed, Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since the Sponsor won't yield to a question..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Bullock: "Representative Watson, where is he?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here."

Bullock: "Representative Watson, do you have any personal experience in this area?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, Mr. Watson. Please respond to the question....."

Watson: "No, I've never been bankrupt. I've never gone bankrupt, no."

Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is perhaps the most heinous Bill that we've voted on this year. I don't know how a

Gentleman that represents a farm community would come to this Body realizing that bankruptcies are up 130% and many of the farmers who want to support their families, who are now forced because of inflation to go into bankruptcy, are now going to have their property confiscated. And I don't know how a Gentleman could go back to the district and tell the district that they represent the people when they could vote for this bad, bad Bill. This is the worst Bill to ever come before the Illinois General Assembly. And I think you ought to be ashamed of yourself of asking this Body to support this piece of legislation. This is terrible and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe. Timer's on."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Spoke in debate?...."

Jaffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, all I want..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from...The Gentleman... Mr. Jaffe, please."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, all I was going to say is I want to be recognized to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Absolutely entitled to that. Mr...The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne. Timer's on."

Van Duyne: "Thank you.. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, the question was asked whether anybody ever had any personal experience like this and I can stand here as living, breathing proof of being one of the people who were victimized by something like this. And when you put out a party as I do in my business, it costs a total of \$1600 and you make roughly \$250

gross on it, and somebody gives you a check for \$1600 and it don't go through, you've got to put on five to six more just to.. just to get even. So therefore, I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn.
Timer's on."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. AS we all know, if this motion succeeds, this Bill will go back into its original form. It's a bankers Bill. We hear a lot about deadbeats taking advantage of things, but let's remember that when those so-called deadbeats go in to the bank or the loan company, they make a loan application in which they're supposed to tell the lender everything they owe. The lender gets a credit report which further corroborates what they owe and what they don't owe. The lender is protected by interest rates with no ceiling on them so that they can lend enough money to make a fair profit and set up a reserve for bad dates..bad debts. The lenders are sophisticated and do you know that after bankruptcy, the lend..the borrower can't take bankruptcy again so they're a better credit risk than they were before? This as someone has said, the worst Bill of the Session. This is a kick them when they're down piece of legislation. If banks are charities we should vote for this. If banks are not-for-profit corporations we should vote for this. And when they are, I will vote for it, but not until then."

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

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

House. When this Bill came before this Body earlier, I momentarily contemplated an Amendment to it that would have established the Illinois Poor Fund. It looks like we've come back to that point, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We kick people when they're down. We avoid the very purpose of bankruptcy which is to give an individual a fresh start. If, indeed, we cannot maintain the limited exemptions that the federal laws give us of the State of Illinois, we are making a very sorry step indeed. I don't understand 104 votes on this Bill. It seems to me that the conscience of this Legislature to the extent there is one, I'm sure there is, the conscience of this Legislature would compel all of us to be aware of the facts of what we're doing. This is not an issue of deadbeat versus good guys. This is a matter of federal...of federal and state law. It's a matter of giving to people who go into bankruptcy the few exemptions..."

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

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, I just wanted to remind the folks that spoke on the other side of the aisle, that farmers in the main and the overwhelming, overwhelming, I'd say close to 100%, do not go bankrupt. They pay their bills and they don't get in over their head and that's what this Bill is all about. It's for people that pay their bills, who've got to pay the price for those who do not pay their bills."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, when I hear the bleeding hearts talk about the poor bankers, I'd like to point out that they've got approximately 173 bankers in this country in jail now. They represent perhaps the highest per capita of any given body. That's how you have.. That's what the problem is. When the bankers come out of jail, all they do..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Ewell: "When the bankers come out of jail, they get everybody from the Judges to the clerks to the ministers to say what good fellows they've been. Well, I tell you, they're scoundrels. That's why you've got approximately 173 in jail. Now you're talking about people at the bottom of the line who ask for minimum exemptions. To turn your back on them is to turn your back on the people who build the country, the people who work, the people who make the country and the people who exploit it the most. And I say, shame on you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'ayes', 58 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. And the House does recede from Amendments 1, 8 and 9. Now, on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe asks for a verification. And Mr. Watson wants a poll of the absentees. Representative Simms, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, can I be verified? I have a Conference Committee report to go to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I didn't hear you. Simms is verified. Mr. Schraeder wants to be verified. Mr. Ralph Dunn..."

Wait a minute."

Jaffe: "Wait a second, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to.. I don't mind a couple people verified, but after that, you know, if they want to sit here for the bloodsuckers, let them sit. I'm still... I'm going to object to anything further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're not going to verify Ralph Capparelli? What about Roman Kosinski? Hearing no objections, they're verified. Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "I hope the Gentleman is withdrawing his objection cause all afternoon we have Conference and all evening we have Conference meetings and we allowed these Members to go to Conference Committee. Now, if he wants to be here July 3rd, till these people get through with their Conference Committee just because he's interested in one, single Bill, that is setting a precedent in here tonight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to anybody going to a Conference Committee, but I see an awful lot of people wanting to leave who are not Conference Committee. If someone wants to go to Conference Committee, I have no objections to that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine.."

Jaffe: "But I don't think that anybody who was not going to a Conference Committee ought to leave."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. Mr. Conti has leave. Mr. Schoeberlein has leave. Mr. Domico has leave. Mr. Ralph Dunn has leave. Mrs. Oblinger, you going to Conference? Yes, you are. Capparelli, I

already got you. Williams, Collins...We need a few people in here. That's right. Now, if you're going to a Conference, as the Gentleman stated, that's one thing. Mr. Meyer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to go to a Conference Committee that is on House Bill 3365 in room 118..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir. No objections. Mr. Mahar wants to stay here. Anyone else? Deuster, you want to go to the hill? Mr. Deuster, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Deuster: "Just for a clarification. Did I understand the Gentleman as objecting to persons who are physically present here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Not at all."

Deuster: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "His only request was if you're going to a Conference Committee, that's fine. If not, please stay here."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jake Wolf has to come back if he's in Conference..cannot be verified. All right. Please proceed to poll the absentees. Mr. Bradley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bradley: "What's the total number right now, Mr. Speaker that's been verified for leave for Conference Committee? I think we're approaching the number of 89 and we might not have to go..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't believe that's the case."

Bradley: "What's the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What are we starting with though, Tony?"

There's 110 'ayes'. We'll proceed as far as the verification. Please proceed to poll the absentees. Let's get going."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: DiPrima. Doyle. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Pechous. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed to verify the affirmative vote. Larry, I want to see you. DiPrima?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima, for what purpose do you seek recognition? How is Mr. DiPrima recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'aye'. Mr. Wolf, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Jake Wolf. Leave to be verified? Leave is granted."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the affirmative: Bower. Bradley. Brummer..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bradley, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Oh, I'm sorry. Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Burnidge. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Farley. Plinn. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Garnisa. Giorgi. Griesheimer. Hallock. Hallstrom. Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huff. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Karpiel. Kelly. Kent. Kosinski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. Mautino.

McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster.
 Meyer. Molloy. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien. Peters.
 Piel. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Rigney.
 Robbins. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Schisler.
 Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tony, slow down a little bit."

Clerk Leone: "Simms..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Skinner. Stanley. Steczo. E.G.Steele.
 C.M.Stiehl. Sumner. Swanstrom. Terzich. Totten.
 Tuerk. Van Duynes. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Walsh.
 Watson. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. J.J.Wolf.
 Sam Wolf. Woodyard. And, Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're starting off with 111 'ayes'. Any
 questions of the Affirmative vote? Mr. Jaffe. Excuse
 me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, for what
 purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. Huff recorded?"

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

Huff: "Change my 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change Mr. Huff to 'no'. Any questions
 of the affirmative vote?"

Jaffe: "Williams?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Mr. Polk as
 'aye'. Who was that?"

Jaffe: "Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Williams? Mr. Williams was
 verified."

Jaffe: "Abramson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Abramson? How is the Gentleman

recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Jaffe: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Barnes? How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove her."

Jaffe: "Anderson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Jaffe: "Zeke Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi? How is Mr. Giorgi recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi? Kindly remove him."

Jaffe: "Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. Put Mr. Abramson back on.
Who did you ask for?"

Jaffe: "Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bell, he's in his chair."

Jaffe: "Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Mrs. Jane Barnes back on. Bianco?
How is Mr. Bianco recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Jaffe: "Birchler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Birchler's in his chair."

Jaffe: "Bluthardt."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Big 'Blu' is there."

Jaffe: "Boucek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Boucek is always there."

Jaffe: "Bower."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bower? He is there."

Jaffe: "Campbell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. Who?"

Jaffe: "Campbell, Chuck Campbell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Chuck Campbell? Mr. Campbell in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Jaffe: "Casey."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Casey is here."

Jaffe: "Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Jaffe: "Collins."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Was Collins verified, Tony? Mr. Collins was verified."

Jaffe: "Epton."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Epton in the chamber? He's in Mr. Ryan's office lying down, but we'll take him off the Roll Call till he gets back."

Jaffe: "Conti."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Conti? He is verified."

Jaffe: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is in the chamber."

Jaffe: "Kelly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kelly? Mr. Kelly....How is Mr. Kelly recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him. Kindly record Mr. Beatty as 'aye'."

Jaffe: "Dyer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Dyer is here."

Jaffe: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson?.."

Jaffe: "Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. Dawson recorded?"

Jaffe: "No. No, that's not right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who then?"

Jaffe: "Hallock."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Jaffe: "Hallock."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hallock? He is here."

Jaffe: "Peters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Peters is here."

Jaffe: "Hoffman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hoffman is here."

Jaffe: "Hallstrom?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. Who was that?"

Jaffe: "Pardon?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "What was the last thing you verified,
Sir?"

Jaffe: "Hallstrom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hoffman is here."

Jaffe: "Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Terry is here."

Jaffe: "Karpziel."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Could I have your attention please?
Could I have your attention please? It's very
difficult in a verification to listen to the Gentleman
seeking the Poll of the Affirmative votes when there's
a loud roar in the room. Mrs. Karpziel is here."

Jaffe: "Ronan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ronan? He is here."

Jaffe: "Kosinski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kosinski? Was Mr. Kosinski verified, Tony? He is verified Sir. Mr. Doyle, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Doyle. Kindly record Mr. Doyle as 'aye'."

Jaffe: "Mahar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mahar is right in his chair."

Jaffe: "Margalus."

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

Jaffe: "Matula."

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

Jaffe: "McCourt."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McCourt's in his chair."

Jaffe: "McGrew."

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

Jaffe: "Ropp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. Who was that?"

Jaffe: "Ropp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "R-O-P-P."

Jaffe: "Right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is in the aisle."

Jaffe: "McMaster."

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

Jaffe: "Reed..."

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

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, this is dilatory. He's not even looking around. He's just reading through the list. He's not even paying any attention...care.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir. He's trying his best. It's very difficult."

Jaffe: "Kulas?.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "First of all, it's a very difficult procedure when a lot of people are roaming around the room. So, Schuneman, please sit down."

Jaffe: "Kulas."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What?.....R-O-P-P. Please stand up. Who was that?"

Jaffe: "Was Ropp there?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ropp is right there, right by his chair, on the earth."

Jaffe: "Kulas."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kulas is here."

Jaffe: "Where? Where is he?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. There's somebody else in his chair. Mr. Kulas? He was here earlier. Remove Mr. Kulas. Ropp, go find Marion."

Jaffe: "Rigney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that?"

Jaffe: "Rigney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "'Red Oak' is here."

Jaffe: "Schisler."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wasn't Kulas verified before, Tony?"

Jaffe: "No, he wasn't, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What? Was he verified or not? Okay. He was not. Schisler? He is...Mr. Schisler, is that you back there? That is Gale Schisler back there. It was Farley back there too. Who else?"

Jaffe: "Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Skinner's in his chair."

Jaffe: "Where is he, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Smiling, as always."

Jaffe: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "In his chair as always."

Jaffe: "Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "A shot from southern Illinois. He's there. There's no film on this."

Jaffe: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Tony? On this question there's 107 'ayes', 58 'nos', and the House does recede from Amendments 1, 8 and 9 on Senate Bill 1728. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. What's the question? Who is seeking recognition? Put Kulas back on there. House Bill 1400, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. On your desks you all have found two packets of Bills about 1600 pages. That's House Bill 1400 and I'm sure you read every page. It's in two parts. The first part merely implements the executive order #3 from last year, which in fact, created the Department of Commerce. Part two of the Bill is purely revisory and was put in to conform to some changes made by LRB. Part two has been reviewed by the Parliamentarian and by the staff on both sides and is purely a revisory change. I move that we concur and adopt the Conference Committee report. Thank you."

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

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Hallock: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Getty: "There are in the Amendments, four Articles. Is that

correct?"

Hallock: "Yes, there are."

Getty: "The four Articles are for the purposes of correcting either prior errors or making revisions. Is that correct?"

Hallock: "Yes, indeed."

Getty: "There are no substantive changes in the law. Is that correct?"

Hallock: "Yes, indeed. And I have reviewed the Bill. The staffs have reviewed the Bill. And the Parliamentarian has also reviewed the Bill and our belief is that there are no other changes beyond those mentioned here."

Getty: "And the clear legislative intent here is to not make any statutory changes of substance, merely revisory or corrective."

Hallock: "Yes, it is."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich with a bad light."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm what Representative Hallock has said."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Very good."

Friedrich: "We piggy-backed on his Bill and he was nice enough to let us do it, to use the Reference Bureau revisionary material that's accumulated for two years. And I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Se.. in Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 1400?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to

explain his vote. It's a normal procedure we do every year. Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to ask the Gentleman who was Sponsor of this legislation if he knew whether this particular agency had ever filed an affirmative action program? And if so, has it ever carried it out?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hallock?"

Hallock: "Yes, they did."

Gaines: "Do they have any increase or decrease in minority employment?"

Hallock: "Well, Mr. Gaines, as you know, with a brand new agency, it's hard to tell whether they have an increase or decrease. It is a brand new agency."

Gaines: "If they filed a report, it states on there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Gaines, this is normal procedure, codification of the Statutes within every .. the closing of every year. It's a request by the Legislative Committee... and.."

Gaines: "I understand what it is, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well..."

Gaines: "But that information is supposed to be in there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's there."

Gaines: "And I'm just asking the Sponsor...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He responded that it was..."

Gaines: "...If it was there, the information."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He responded that it was. Any further discussion? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. Kindly record Mr. Gaines as 'no'. And Mr. Keane as 'aye'. And Mrs.

Balanoff as 'aye'. And Leverenz as 'aye'. And Vitek as 'aye'. And Mr. Mugalian as 'aye'. Kosinski as 'aye'. Christensen as 'aye'. Bradley as 'aye'. And would the t.v. lights kindly turn themselves off? Cal, ...you turned around. What's the count, Tony? Let's go. On this question there's 153 'ayes', 1 'no' and the House does concur to Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 1400. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3019. Conference Committee reports on Supplemental #4, Mr. Flinn. Flinn. Where is he? Senate Bill 4..569, Mr. Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we refuse to recede from House Amendments 3, 4 and 5 and request a Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House nonconcur in the Conference Committee on Senate Bill 569. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed? And the House does nonconcur to Conference Committee on Senate Bill 569. Senate Bill 480...1480. 1480. Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 569 I intended to call for a Conference Committee. I'm not sure I made the right motion. Did I?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You had made the motion to nonconcur. It was adopted by the House and a second Conference Committee has been requested."

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now, let's get back to .."

Hoffman: "1480.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "1480, Senate Bill 1480."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur in Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1480 which appears on Supplemental Calendar #1. The Bill is exactly as it was when it left the House with one exception, and in that we provide in Section 76 of the School Code that when we're talking about modifying School District boundaries, we require that the Regional Board shall take into consideration the boundaries of overlapping townships and municipalities. That's all the additional change in the original Bill as it left the House. And I would move for the concurrence in the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1480."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 to Senate Bill 1480?' On that question, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the speaker yield please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Sponsor will."

Hallstrom: "Excuse me. I'm sorry. Would the Spncsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Hallstrom: "Representative Hoffman, I noticed in our analysis it says that this change is intended to help a part of Skokie detached from the Evanston School District and attached to the Skokie District, the part that says, 'Senate Amendment'. My concern is that this matter did already did go before the Regional Board of Trustees and it was voted down. And the

School District in my district, the Evanston School District, they're not for this. Are you aware of this?"

Hoffman: "Yes. Yes, Ma'am. I'm aware of that. This particular additional language was agreed to by the two Senators representing both of the districts and the fact of the matter is, all this says is, that this can be taken into consideration, or they shall take the fact into consideration, the fact that the boundaries of overlapping townships and municipalities are involved. This does not direct the Regional Board to do anything except take that into consideration when they make their decision."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Conference Committee report attempts to do is something that could have been done all during this Session. What it really is doing is saying that in Evanston School District that part of that district can disconnect themselves in a way not presently permitted. Now, here we are, with hardly two hours left in this Session and a Bill of this magnitude is put before us. Now, in all fairness, I plea with you to vote 'no' on concurrence on this Conference Committee. This is not the right way. It's the wrong way to do it. It could completely emasculate the Evanston School District if we pass and concur with this particular Conference Committee report. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur

in Conference Committee report #1 to 1480?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Jack, give me an 'aye'. Kindly record Dr. Capuzi as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 41 'nos', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Conference Committee report #1...Yes? On 1480. Kindly record Mr. McMaster as 'no' instead of 'aye'. All right. And, Mr. Ropp as 'no'. And McCourt...What's the count? Kindly record Mr. Steczo as 'aye'. Mr. Donovan as 'aye'. Simms, sit down. What's the count? Simms wants to be recorded as 'aye'..'no'. I'm sorry. Joe Ebbesen is looking for his glasses. 'Aye'. On this question there are 97 'aye' and 44 'no'. 'No', Mr. McCourt?"

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have this Roll Call verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is entitled to that request, even though 97 people are here. Mr. Daniels wants to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Conti wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Kane as 'no', or is that an 'aye'? I'm sorry. Mr. Sam Wolf? Mr. Henry as 'aye'. Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Mr. Vitek as 'aye'. Mr. Piel as 'aye'. Mr. Pechous as 'aye'. Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Well..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Keep it up. We'll go to 177."

McCourt: "Ted, you're doing a very good job here..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We try."

McCourt: "It just seems to me that I hope my memory stays with me the next time I have to vote for some crazy

project that's outside of Cook County and especially Evanston. I ...Forget the verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. And what's that count, Tony? On this question there are 105 'ayes', 43 'nos'... Mr. Ebbesen?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I think I'd better go back from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "See there. You'll never golf again.."

Ebbesen: "Can I be recorded 'no'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Definitely. 104 to 44. And the House does concur with the Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 1480. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3019, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, this is.. this is Conference Committee report #2 and I would move that the House adopt ..accept the Conference Committee report and I guess you could call this a going out of business Bill. And it looks like I have lost a long hard fight with the Senate. They have not agreed with me and all this Bill does now is furnish enough money to close up shop on the St. Louis Metropolitan Airport Authority. I really think it's a shame. To not accept this Conference Committee report would create havoc for an organization that's been in existence for some ten years and all this does is let them close up and go out of business. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Conference Committee report #2 on House Bill 3019. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten.

Let's have a little order please."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, thank you..and.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, thank you, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "You've indicated this is a going out of business appropriation. How much is it?"

Flinn: "\$22,800 or something of that sort..."

Totten: "22,000?"

Flinn: "Maybe 888, 15% or something like that. I don't know what it is."

Totten: "Under the Airport Authority's present operating budget, how much would that take.. How long would that take then, to spend that money?"

Flinn: "Well, I don't think they'll spend all the money. This is the maximum that they might need and once they can wind up their business, such as doing all their tax reports and all the necessary bookwork as required by the Auditor General and that sort of thing, they will be out of business. This does not include the Director's salary, or none of the other so-called lobbyists. This is the office people, three office people and it's the maximum amount that might be needed to go out of business."

Totten: "Are you convinced that there will be...there will no longer be an Airport Authority?"

Flinn: "Well, I'm convinced that we ought to keep one, but I am convinced that we're out of the business now. And sadly I say so."

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House, if the Sponsor who, in good faith, has put forth this appropriation is convinced that this will be the last of it and I take him at his word, then I am willing to support minimal appropriation to close shop on what has been one of the biggest rat holes this state has poured money into and if this does nothing more than close them down, I'm willing to go along."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis. Davis please. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I was going to echo Don Totten's remarks. After four and a half million dollars of the state money, this has been a long day, but hearing this closing out, I think it's the best move we've heard all day and it was well worth it."

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

Skinner: "Sounds good to me too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Everybody's so happy. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've always heard that Church isn't over until the fat lady sings and apparently she has sang enough. So, I give up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please be careful, Mr. Flinn. The question is, 'Shall the House concur and adopt Conference Committee report #2 on House Bill 3019?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Bruce, give me an 'aye'. One for the Misses. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kindly record Mr. Schoeberlein as 'aye'. Please take the

record. On this question there's 133 'ayes', 20 'nos', 7 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Conference Committee report #2 on House Bill 3019. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, these Conference Committee reports' analyses are coming to our desks a mile a minute. I was wondering if you would be able to recall a Bill, would it be possible also at that time to indicate the Bill that's going to follow, that's going to be next.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, surely. I'd be more than happy to."

Mulcahey: "Well, listen. You're very kind, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. That's the way he is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's the way we always are. House Bill 3035. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, now that's on..Supplemental #4 I believe. It's the appropriation Bill."

Hoxsey: "Right. Yes, I move that we refuse to adopt the Con..First Conference Committee report on House Bill 3035 and ask that a second Conference Committee report (sic) be appointed. Want it..Want to know why? All right. I'll tell you why. They cut three analysts out of the appropriation, three that we need to implement the Data Center, and we're going to be dealing with the 1980 federal census. And I'm certain that if you people want that done properly, the Federal Census Bureau estimates that four or five thousand computer tapes will be sent to Illinois. I

think we need these and that's why I feel not to adopt this Conference report and that another one be appointed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Motion is not to adopt Conference Committee report #1. Tony says he can't put it on the Board. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Membership to vote against that motion so we can adopt this Conference Committee report. Eight of the conferees signed the ..the report and the way I look at it, myself..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, John. Give the Gentleman some attention. Please proceed, Sir."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the way I look at it, if the Gentleman who heads the Bureau of the Budget after eight Members of that Conference have signed the Conference Committee report, had a problem, he surely would have come to one of us. He didn't talk to anybody. I'm sure that for a few lousy jobs that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget isn't going to start crying on the floor of the House. And I think that eight of us agreed to the report. I think that there's 89 Members of the House who will agree to the Conference Committee report and I would urge you to vote 'no' on this. There's no need why we have to meet again for a couple of lousy jobs that mean nothing.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're right.."

Matijevich: "So I would urge the Members to vote 'no' on this and I will follow it with a motion to adopt the Conference Committee report."

think we need these and that's why I feel not to adopt this Conference report and that another one be appointed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Motion is not to adopt Conference Committee report #1. Tony says he can't put it on the Board. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Membership to vote against that motion so we can adopt this Conference Committee report. Eight of the conferees signed the ..the report and the way I look at it, myself..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, John. Give the Gentleman some attention. Please proceed, Sir."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the way I look at it, if the Gentleman who heads the Bureau of the Budget after eight Members of that Conference have signed the Conference Committee report, had a problem, he surely would have come to one of us. He didn't talk to anybody. I'm sure that for a few lousy jobs that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget isn't going to start crying on the floor of the House. And I think that eight of us agreed to the report. I think that there's 89 Members of the House who will agree to the Conference Committee report and I would urge you to vote 'no' on this. There's no need why we have to meet again for a couple of lousy jobs that mean nothing.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're right.."

Matijevich: "So I would urge the Members to vote 'no' on this and I will follow it with a motion to adopt the Conference Committee report."

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

Hoxsey: "Thank you. Well, I would disagree with the previous speaker when he called them 'lousy jobs'. Representative, I don't know of an analyst job that's a lousy job. And I say we need them. I would appreciate your supporting me on this when I ask for a second Conference report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the Lady's motion to reject the first Conference Committee report prevail?' All in favor...and ask for a second Conference Committee. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Kindly record me as 'no' over there. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 'ayes', and 87 nos'. And none recorded as 'present'. And the Lady's motion does not prevail. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. Mr. Skinner."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker..."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would now move to adopt Conference Committee report to House Bill 3035 and both the Republicans and Democrats on the Conference Committee worked together on this. We see no need to meet again. We believe it's a good Conference Committee report and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is now, 'Will the House concur..accept Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3035?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', 29 'nos', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3035. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3153. Calendar #3. Tony, Calendar #3. 2153 (sic). The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3153 deals with the issue of minimum salary for teachers in the State of Illinois other than the City of Chicago. The only change in the Conference Committee report from the Senate Amendments is simply that we provide that this particular Bill does not utilize the salaries of teachers in the Chicago District for computations for the minimum salary provisions within the Bill. We accept each of the Senate Amendments pursuant to an agreement with the Senate in adopting a report. I would be glad to answer questions, and I would move for concurrence in Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 3153."

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

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't believe a Bill could get worse in the Senate. Maybe that is an overstatement. Maybe they do get worse in the Senate usually, but this certainly went along that path. When this Bill went out of here, it established a minimum salary for teachers. Now that would have not raised many salaries in my district in Northern

Illinois, but it would have raised a great many salaries in the southern 45 counties of this state. When it was coming back from the Senate, what the Senate has mandated is that the state pay all of the additional salary that is necessary to bring it up to the minimum. Now, what does that mean to anybody living in Chicago or anybody living in basically the northern half of the state? That it means is that we're going to have to take money that would go in the state school aid formula or one of the categorical formulas and funnel it down to southern Illinois where apparently they don't pay their teachers as much as we pay our teachers. Now maybe that is because they have lower standards of living, lower living costs, maybe it is because they don't value their teachers as highly as we value our teachers, but for whatever reason, this Bill in...this...the Amendment to this Bill...the Senate Amendment that is a Conference Committee report is setting up a massive income transfer from the populated part of the state to the less populated part of the state. So, if you want to vote against your district's interests, and you live probably north of Springfield, you surely ought to be voting for this Bill, but if you want to vote for your district's interests, and you want to make sure that the education money we put in the budget ends up in your district, I think you ought to vote against the Conference Committee report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. Yourell, please."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield

to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Yourell: "Larry, can you tell me for example, in suburban Cook County, what percentage of teachers are not at a minimum salary?"

Stuffle: "I would be glad to answer that question. Within the purview of this Bill as written now, Representative Yourell, almost every teacher within the suburban ring would already be covered. The estimate is that only after the third year, only three thousand teachers in the entire state out of one hundred thousand would be affected by this particular Bill. In the first two years, that number is less than one thousand as I understand it, and for all intents and purposes, virtually no one in the suburban ring because the salaries are much, much higher there than they are in downstate Illinois."

Yourell: "What is the effective date of this...?"

Stuffle: "The effective date of this Bill is next year so that it is indeed a mandatory program. It kicks in after the January 1 date making it a state mandated program, and we spelled out that that is the case in the Bill, and we spelled out as well that this would be funded from a separate line item appropriation so that we would not be tapping the formula money that Representative Skinner referred to in his earlier remarks."

Yourell: "So what I can tell my school board in my district is that it won't require, as some of them had indicated to me in letters, that a referendum would be required to...in the educational fund to pay for the

additional costs? So this would be under the mandated programs, and the state would be responsible for the payment of the cost of the program?

Stuffle: "That's right..."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Stuffle: "...The estimated costs in the first year for the entire state is only a half of a million dollars."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 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. Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, no one is in doubt on this Bill. The Bill does not apply to the city of Chicago. The Bill does not use the teachers' salaries in the city of Chicago for the calculations herein. The Bill provides that it is a program to be funded by the state from a separate line item appropriation. The Bill provides the minimum salary in relationship to the average of two year previous salary increases in the state. For the most part, there will be virtually very few districts affected. We're only talking about the lowest paid teachers in the State of Illinois in this Bill. There was circulated some time ago, an estimate that somehow this would cost the city of Chicago \$16,000,000. It doesn't affect the city at all. The first year estimated costs are a half million dollars,

and by the third year the estimate is that it would affect about three percent of the teachers in the entire State of Illinois. I would ask for a concurrence on Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 3153."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with the Conference Committee report on House Bill 3153?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I object to this Bill on three counts. Number one, it is discriminatory by excluding the city of Chicago without any justification. Number two, it attempts to substitute the General Assembly for the Illinois Education Association and the Illinois Federation of Teachers. We are not the bargaining agent for teachers. Let the school administrators at the local level determine through collective bargaining what salaries should be. Number three, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the taxpayers in the city of Chicago, and the taxpayers in the suburban areas are going to pay for it through the general revenue fund of this state. If they want higher salaries downstate, let them pay for it locally. I urge a 'nay' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan. Timer's on."

Hanahan: "Yes, and the former Gentleman should be in the forefront of the fight for collective bargaining. You know, you can't have your rake.. cake, and eat it at

the same time. You can't be saying down here that you're not... you don't want to participate as the judicial branch of government in the sense that you're going to make contract law, but at the same time, this General Assembly has failed time and again, and mainly on your side of the aisle because of your refusal to support collective bargaining."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, particularly I want to point to what Representative Hanahan said. We're talking about the poorest of the poor teachers, not necessarily poor districts, because in many of the districts that refuse to negotiate, there is a great deal of wealth, and they simply don't want to pay a living wage. We've talked about a living wage for everybody from state's attorneys to coroners. We've mandated it by law. This is no different a situation that applies to teachers in this state. The city of Chicago, for the most part, in fact for the entire part, in the coming fiscal year will not be affected in any way. That's why they were taken out of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 58 'nos', one recorded as 'present.' And the House does concur with Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 3153. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Kindly record

Mr. Leverenz as 'aye' on that Bill. Senate Bill 1664.
Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Conference Committee report regarding Senate Bill 1664 simply continues the ongoing projects that have been started by the Capital Development Board. This is a reappropriation Bill. We receded from House Amendment #3 and concurred in House Amendments 2, 4, 5 and 6. I offer to move the adoption of the Conference Committee report #1 regarding Senate Bill 1664."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1664, which appears on Supplemental #5?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Please record me as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 27 'nos', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur and adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 1664. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1821. I'm sorry. House Bill 821. On Supplemental #4, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 821 is in reference to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. The Conference Committee report #1 recommends that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 and further amend Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 extends the authority of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority to include commercial projects. Senate

Amendment #2 which was put on by the Illinois Municipal League gives municipalities veto power over the projects of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority located in the particular municipality. The Amendment..The Senate Amendment 2 and #1 restores the language talking about and declaring the area that the Illinois Industrial Development Authority will work in will be areas of labor surplus where the unemployment rate is 4.5% or above. And I move that we con..we adopt the first Conference Committee report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman

from

McHenry, Mr.

Skinner."

Skinner: "Speaker..Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, whenever I see that State Government is going to help shopping centers, it brings to mind the development arm of Sears called Homart, which is at the present time in the process of raping the taxpayers in west Dundee and in indeed in the State of Illinois. Shopping centers traditionally are located in places where the land is cheap..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Skinner..."

Clerk Leone: "House Calendar Supplemental 6 is now being distributed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Skinner: "Shopping centers are traditionally located in areas where the land is cheap and where the governments are compliant. In the case of the State Department of Transportation, the compliance is unbelievable. It's almost as if the shopping center

developer is the king and the Department of Transportation is the vassal. What we are doing here is extending vassal status to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. Now, the Illinois Industrial Development Authority has traditionally been an agency which has funded factories, manufacturing concerns, concerns that create new wealth rather than merely transfer wealth or transfer sales, commercial sales, in the case of shopping centers from downtown areas to the edge of town. I think this is just an atrocious, extension of the tax subsidized interests by the Federal Government, the tax break that we are allowed as State Legislators to grant to local..well, to commercial enterprises or to businesses. I think it should be limited to factories. I don't think it should be ...include shopping centers. I note in my analysis also notes that small stores could qualify. And I wonder if we are back to the ..the concept of the one of the Democrats small business Bills which originally was introduced to help people go..start 'Ma and Pa' grocery stores, which of course, are on the leading edge of entrepreneurial activity in the United States today. This is the only analysis I've written 'kill' on so far. It's by far the worst Conference Committee report I've seen and I hope it does not achieve majority vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape."

Slape: : "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the Lady's motion to accept the report. The only thing she's trying to do and the only thing she's saying to the General

Assembly and to the public in general is that in areas where we have high surplus of labor, we should make things available in that community so we can put the labor to work constructively to build the community back up economically. This is a step in the right direction to reviving economically depressed areas and I think she wants our support in this. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 821?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Mike? Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain my 'aye' vote by saying that this corrects also another inequity that only DuPage, Bureau, DeKalb, McLean, Woodford, Menard and Wabash counties that we're not eligible for this funding are now eligible under this Bill. I'd recommend an 'aye' vote for it. I think it's important in all those counties, deserve the same treatment as the rest of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate Amendment to House Bill 821 makes this a much stronger Bill. We know that small businesses account for 90% of the new businesses and new jobs in Illinois. And I think that the Amendments that the Senate put on there make the Bill a lot stronger and therefore, we ought to concur in this

Senate..in this Conference report..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Younge: "So we ought to concur in this first Conference Committee report..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Ma'am. Your time is up. Would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Younge: "All right. This..the expanded powers of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority will help to create more jobs in this state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey. Timer's on."

Huskey: "Well, nevermind.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 61 'nos', 5 recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 821. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1230. Mr. Kane, on Supplemental Calendar #3. Before we get to that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, for the interest of time, that's all. I was just looking at some of the buttons that are being pushed on some of these Bills. So, just so we don't have any more verification of Roll Calls- it's going to be a long night- will you kindly remind the Members to push their own switches?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken, Sir. 1230, Mr. Kane. And the next Bill will be Senate Bill 185,

Mr. Davis. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1230 originally increased the numbers of trustees on the Rockford Mass Transit District. It was amended in the Senate to include Springfield and Champaign. The Conference Committee report deletes Champaign because Champaign did not want to increase the size of its trustees. So, with this Conference Committee report the number of trustees of the Springfield and Rockford Mass Transit District would be increased from five to seven and it would affect only those two districts. I'd ask for your concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 1230?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk ...The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a question and have the Sponsor.."

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

Satterthwaite: "...Tell me. Champaign is not in this any longer? Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane, would you kindly respond to the Lady? She knows? What about the rest of us?"

Kane: "You don't need to know."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We won't take the record."

Kane: "Champaign is out, your, Honor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as

'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 1230. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 185, Mr. Davis. Supplemental Calendar #3. Yes, Sir."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're back to Senate Bill 185. I believe it's been explained to a great length earlier. I know some other people who want to speak on it, so I won't talk. It creates the Act of threatening public officials. It also addresses the holding of weapons and firearms and bombs and things of that kind by inmates within an institution. I simply move its adoption and ask Representative Getty to close."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I previously asked about .."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Dick. Please proceed, Sir."

Mugalian: "I previously asked about the apparent multiplicity of Conference Committee reports. I now.. I now have.. an analysis on Conference Committee report #2, I have two of those and they are both..They're substantially different from one another. And I would like a ruling as to the propriety of having two Conference Committee reports that are not technically different, or different in a minor way, but in major substantive ways."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll let the Clerk respond to that. Mr. O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "The first time we printed this, there were three Bills mixed up and on the first page, it said,

'Senate Bill 185', but on preceding pages.."

Mugalian: "No, I'm not concerned with the misprinting problem. That's solved to my satisfaction. But there are two substantive reports. One of them, the Synopsis indicates it adds five new provisions and the other one shows three new provisions."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could the..."

Mugalian: "One of them has aggravated kidnapping, the other one does not, as a new Act..."

Davis: "The second one you have, Representative Mugalian, is a revised copy of the Conference Committee report."

Mugalian: "But it's an entirely different report."

Davis: "I understand that. Habitual offenders and aggravated kidnapping are in that Conference Committee report. The original one and the revised one does not contain since that issue was addressed the other night."

Mugalian: "Well, that's exactly my point. How can you have two different Conference Committee reports?"

Davis: "Was a revised copy, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Seems you're begging the question. Was there a notice for the subsequent meeting?"

Davis: "Yes, there was. Well, to my knowledge, there was. Let me put it that way. I attended the meeting, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Do you...Did you see the notices and you note they were delivered to all of the Members?"

Davis: "No, I don't know if they were delivered to all of the Members. I received one."

Mugalian: "Well, I mean, these are two different Bills..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mugalian, excuse me. According to

the Clerk, both the House and the Senate are acting on Senate Bill 185 as revised. So kindly address your remarks on that issue, Sir. Now, I believe the Clerk has brought it to your attention once before. If you have something against the revised report, please proceed. Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I think I'm within my rights, Mr. Speaker, to raise a point of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, you are."

Mugalian: "Point of order is that the two Conference Committee reports are substantially...substantively entirely different. And I ask for a ruling on that question. I'm not talking about the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Write it out..."

Mugalian: "...The printing error..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There was an error by the printer, not an action of the Conference Committee, according to the Parliamentarian. Wait a minute. We're getting another ruling now. Dick, why don't you come up? Kindly talk to Mr. Mugalian. Take the Bill out of the record for the fourth time. Mr. Skinner, on a point of order."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Supplemental Calendar #6 is marked as distributed 10:25 p.m. I did not receive it until 10:43 p.m. Could we correct the time?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, Sir. If you recall, the Clerk made the announcement at the time the Calendar was being distributed..."

Skinner: "It was not being distributed though."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It was being distributed."

Skinner: "Well, I have my whole row here as witnesses that

we did not get it until ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "God love your row and yourself..."

Skinner: "We're in the second row. We're not two."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1407. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do adopt Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 1407. House Bill 1407, in its present form..present form as embodied in Conference Committee report #1, raises the interest rate which IHDA can sell bonds at ten and three quarters. IHDA has been out of the market for nine months and unable to fund projects because their cap has been nine percent and they have not been able to sell bonds because the bond rate..the interest rate was over nine percent. This would raise that to ten and three quarters. Also 1407 also creates a \$150 million statewide home loan mortgage program. There is no state money involved. There is no state risk involved. This is a one-time deal created by a loop hole in a pending piece of legislation in Congress that we must act on tonight. Because, unless the bonds are sold and the mortgage is committed by December 31st, 1980, we will not be able to qualify for this. These bonds are exempt from federal income tax. If sold today on the market, they would be sold at approximately 8.3% and the mortgages across the state would be between nine and ten percent. This would..Each lending institution would get a maximum of \$500,000 for home loan mortgages. This would allow up to 300 lending institutions and

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 30, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

state..banks and savings and loans in the State of Illinois to get this reduced money for home loan mortgages and three to four thousand mortgages in the State of Illinois would be created. Forty percent of the money would go to those with adjusted gross income of \$29,500 and less. The remaining sixty percent for those with \$50,000 and less adjusted family gross income. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will consider this Session. It is similar to the home loan mortgage program that was recently created and instituted in the city of Chicago. This is government funding for low and moderate income housing. We must act today because of a loop hole which allows us to create a statewide authority ..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion?.."

Marovitz: "...To sell the bonds..."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the previous question be moved?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed? The previous question has been moved. The question is, 'Shall the House concur and adopt Conference Committee report to House Bill 1407?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill. It's an excellent Bill. It will provide incentive for people to get single family home loans. I see it's got enough votes..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 154 'ayes', 7 'nos', 5 recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt first Conference Committee report on House Bill 1407. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1726, Mr. Mautino. Supplemental Calendar #3."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do recede in Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1726 and we concur with the..excuse me, the Conference Committee report #1 which basically took out Amendment #2. Amendment #2 was a..."

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

Mautino: "Was a provision included by Senator Frank Savickas on the municipal employees in the city and it was taken out because it was drafted incorrectly. The Conference Committee, I believe, was signed by all ten Members. And I move that we adopt Conference Committee report #1 on 1726. The subject matter of 1726 was unemployment compensation."

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Catania: "I notice that there was an Amendment offered to say that sexual harassment would be..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mrs. Catania. Gentleman would you kindly move your conference over there? Would you give the Lady your attention please? Would

you give the Lady your attention please?..."

Catania: "I notice that there was an Amendment offered that said that sexual harassment would be considered good cause for leaving a job and therefore the person who was a victim would be eligible for unemployment compensation. Is that language still in this Bill?"

Mautino: "That was Amendment #6 presented by Representative Kulas. It's in the Bill. The only Amendment that came out was the one on municipal employees, the jailers at the Cook County Jail. It was drafted incorrectly and your Amendment stayed in, yes."

Catania: "So, that's in and sexual harassment is good cause for leaving employment and does not interfere with eligibility for unemployment benefits?"

Mautino: "It's the identical..yes. The answer is yes. It's the identical provisions of 2824."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment which was deleted in the Senate was one which I offered on the floor of the House and I agree with the deletion of that Amendment. I join the Gentleman in asking for an 'aye' vote on this concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Hanahan: "Representative, is this Bill as you're asking for our 'aye' vote, in conformance with the agreed Bill process?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "This Conference Committee report was adopted by the Senate, as I understand it. It is not in the identical form of 2824. Many of the major provisions are in. The suitable employment provision that you and I discussed on Second Reading remains in the Bill and I know you object to that provision."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there was an awful lot of explanation. To answer correctly, it would have been 'no'. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know how you feel about unemployment compensation, whether it's good, bad or indifferent, but I think a lot of us have undertaken a lot of abuse, needless abuse, over the years in our changes in the unemployment compensation law, and I had assumed that the agreement that was made is that any changes in the unemployment compensation law would be in accordance with the agreed Bill process that all of us want to hide behind so none of us have to put up with the abuse that takes place on changes in unemployment compensation. Now, if you want to violate that kind of trust that we place into the Members that are appointed by the Governor to advise the Legislature on what methods and what mechanical changes are necessary on an agreed process by management, by the public members and by the labor representative Members, if you want to turn your back on that kind of agreement, and be continually harassed, year in and year out and then come back and wait until somebody's in the controlling position again, and then say, we're not going to have an agreed

process anymore because you have violated it in 1980 on June 30th, by voting for a measure that did not come from the agreed Bill process, don't at that time say and beat your breasts about well, we should have listened..."

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

Hanahan: "...To the agreed Bill process. I suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, those that believe in the agreed Bill process, whether you like it or don't, that you either vote with it or you don't. But then don't have it both ways later on. As for me, I oppose this Conference Committee report because it does not comply with, it does not comply with the agreed Bill process."

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

Ebbesen: "Well, 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 'no'. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to close."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. About the best closing argument I can give to this legislation is read to you the ten names that signed this Conference Committee; Roger Keats, Aldo DeAngelis, Jerome Joyce, Sam Maragos, James Donnewald, Tim Simms, Cal Schuneman, Jim McPike, Bruce Farley and Dick Mautino. I think it's a fair provision and I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur

and adopt the first Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1726?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 151 'ayes', 6 'nos', 1 recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt the first Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1726. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2710. Mr. Garmisa, on Supplemental Calendar #5."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask the House to adopt Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 2710."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "As I understand it,...Representative Garmisa, this is the Bill to regulate the the practice of orthotics and prosthetics. Is that correct?"

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "And as the...as the Bill left the House, it gave what I considered and many others considered a rather inordinate power in the American Academy of Orthonists and Prosthesis. Is that correct?"

Garmisa: "That has been taken out of the Bill."

Leinenweber: "Alright, at one time it required the person to become a registered...whatever these people are, that they had to pass a test that was given by this private outfit. Is that test requirement still in the Bill?"

Garmisa: "There is a grandfather clause in the Bill right now, Representative."

Leinenweber: "No, I understand that. I am asking whether or

not there is a test requirement in the Bill for someone to become in the future...to become a licensed or registered practitioner?"

Garmisa: "Yes, there is."

Leinenweber: "And who administers that test?"

Garmisa: "That is administered by the Department of Registration and Education."

Leinenweber: "Who prepares the test?"

Garmisa: "How was that?"

Leinenweber: "Who prepares the tests?"

Garmisa: "The test is prepared by the Department of Registration and Education."

Leinenweber: "Alright, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, This Bill seeks to get the...Illinois into the business of regulating the practice of orthotics and prosthetics. It will become one of the numerous new occupations which the State of Illinois seeks to license and regulate. I am not sure what exactly is in the Conference Committee report, but when it left the House, among other things, it required a person in order to become registered, that they pass a test which was to have been administered by the trade outfit of this particular type of practitioners. These people currently operate under and usually at the behest of medical doctors. People go to these practitioners upon reference of medical doctors who prescribe the particular type of prosthetic that is to be administered. It is not a good idea to enact this Bill because there is no need to regulate this particular profession. If there was a need to regulate them, the grandfather clause which allows

everybody who is currently practicing to continue to practice for the remainder of their life would prove that we can get along without the state regulating this profession. I think it is a bad idea. It is going to tend to make a small group...protect a small group in this practice by keeping other people out. This only can raise prices. It is anti-consumer. It is unnecessary, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, in answer to the...last Representative that spoke on this Bill, I am not closing...I think he was putting this in the form of a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Garmisa. We'll get back to you. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson. Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan. Ronan."

Ronan: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'...opposed...we don't have to go through that nonsense. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to call to your attention that this Bill passed the House before it went before the Regulatory Commission which we set up under the sunset laws last year. Our Commission did look into this, and under the sunrise provisions we voted that this was not the kind of an agency that should be regulated at this time. And therefore, I support because of the reasons that Mr. Leinenweber said that we should vote 'no' on this."

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

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You will recall that we did have quite a bit of discussion before this Bill did pass the House, and I urge you to vote for it. I may have a personal interest in it or a conflict of interest, but as another Representative says, I have to vote my conscience, and my conscience is in answer to some of the questions that have been made...or that have been asked, I did not go back to a physician when I went to get this brace that I am now wearing, and if I did not get to someone who really knew what they were doing, I would not be able to walk around this floor. It is a very important Bill. There are more and more people now who have had strokes and other kinds of physical problems who need attention, and need braces, and they need someone who really knows what they are doing. I know people...many of you are not for licensing, but in this area of a health service which means so much to a human being who has had a problem like I have had, it is so important, and I urge you please to vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "On line 27 and 28 of the first page of the Conference Committee report are the words 'the physician Member of the Board shall be appointed by' end of quote. By whom will that physician be appointed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Would you repeat that question, Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: Yes, on lines 27 and 28 of the first page of the

Conference Committee report 'a physician Member of the Board' is mentioned, and it says 'he or she shall be appointed by someone', and I would just like to know what the...who the...by whom will the appointment be made?"

Garmisa: "He would be appointed by the Governor."

Skinner: "By the Governor. Who else serves on this Board?"

Garmisa: "The licensed orthotists, a licensed prosthesist, a consumer that would be using orthotists, a consumer that would be using prosthetics, and a surgeon...an orthopedic surgeon would be the fifth Member of the Board."

Skinner: "All of whom will be picked by the Governor?"

Garmisa: "All five would be picked by the Governor."

Skinner: "Now, on page two, lines 15, 16, and 17 of Section 5A of the Conference Committee report says 'the director shall not exercise and powers or duties enumerated in the fact except upon recommendation of the Board'. That makes the director pretty impotent, doesn't it? Does the director have any powers left with regard to this new licensed profession?"

Garmisa: "The director would have to act upon the direction of the Board."

Skinner: "Why have it in the Department of Registration and Education if the director has no power?"

Garmisa: "Because that...in all of these types of Boards we do have their recommendations that the director of D and E actually follows their recommendations whenever he sees fit."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "This is the only licensing Bill which is still alive. Every other one has been killed this Session. Every other one should have been killed this Session. This one probably also should have been killed prior to this time. There has been a running commentary in the press summary...as reported in the 'Lee Enterprise Newspapers' of the progress of this Bill. For the life of me, one can hardly understand how it is still alive except there must be some miracle worker behind the scenes waving a wand. I don't think the case has been made on a logical basis. I think the case has been made on an emotional basis that we should license another profession. At the present time, over one half million Illinois residents are licensed by the State of Illinois. That is far too many. Passage of House Bill 2710 will take us one step further back into the middle ages of the guild system where one has to have training in one's profession and be certified basically by one's profession in order to...in order to practice a trade. That seems to me to be the wrong direction in which to go, and I would hope this Bill would not receive sufficient votes to...to gain passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It was my pleasure earlier this evening to serve on the Conference Committee that worked on this Bill to bring it to the House this evening. Part of that Committee's responsibility as we saw it is to see to it that this Act would not become too restrictive but at the same time protect the public. As far as

the former speaker's mentioning of a powerless director, I think that if he looked at all the statutes governing the licensing of this sort he would find out that that is the normal language and the fact that it has been taken from the statutes almost verbatim. Nothing directs the director or the Board from having a two-way street where the director can make suggestions and be ran around...and be ran through the Board, and they could come back with it on their own ideals before the director makes his final choice. Certain people have been exempted from this to protect them. We have changed the Bill where it says you only have to have eight hours refresher course in a seminar year instead...the old classroom requirement. We've exempted pharmacists and other trades people who do this incidental to the regular business, but I would point out that we live in an age now where there is a lot of orthopedic work being done, and especially on youngsters where a doctor just simply gives you a prescription and tells you to go someplace and have braces, or twisters, or something of this sort applied to a child. I think it is only fair that we promise the parents when they take their child to someone of this nature that the person is qualified and willing to do the work proficiently. And I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie. For what purpose do you arise?"

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. With an announcement. Would Members of the Joint Committee to propose an argument against the proposed Amendment

to amend the Article Four of the Constitution...the Pat Quinn petition that is, please meet in five minutes in the Speaker's office."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?'. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Garmisa to close."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Sandquist raised the point about the Sunset Committee voting four-three against this Bill. That vote was taken before the Amendments were put on there that after the Amendments were on, this took care of the objections that were raised by the Sunset Committee. And I also want to state that the medical licensing profession is in favor of this Bill that they worked with us on all of these...on the Amendments that put this Bill in the shape that the medical profession wanted it in. There was a further reference made, and I believe that this was by Representative Cal Skinner that evidently there was a miracle worker somewhere in back of this Bill, and he was speaking the truth when he made that statement, and that miracle worker that has been working real hard for the passage of this Bill was one of the colleagues of mine and a Member of this House who ten years ago lost a limb, and when he went to try and get the proper fitting, and I went with him all over the

country. There was nowhere in this country or in any of the foreign countries that he was able to get a proper fit or proper attention given to him in any of the houses or hospitals that make these prostheses or these orthosities. And let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this profession right now is practiced in many instances by people that are nothing less than a carpenter, and I am not degrading the profession of carpentry. What I am saying is that the people that are making limbs and people that are making braces should be people that know their business and know what they're doing. And all we're asking for in the regulation of this industry is for just that, that the people that do work on people that are short on a limb or that need braces should know their business. We do have a grandfather clause involved here that would take care of the people that are practicing the profession at the present time. They would have to be subject to a seminar of eight hours per year in order for them to improve their profession and to do a better job than they are doing, and this is a Bill that is sorely in need of regulation in this state that would regulate horseshoeing and many other subjects that have absolutely no interest as far as the human anatomy is concerned. This is a badly needed Bill in this state, and everybody in this House should vote an 'aye' vote on this very good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your motion, Representative Garmisa?"

Garmisa: "That we adopt Conference Committee report #1 on House Bill 2710."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, the question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 2710. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, during the 16 years that I have served in the General Assembly I have not heard one director of the Department of Registration and Education ask for the authority to regulate another occupation or profession. Instead, each of them has said, 'We can't effectively regulate the occupations and professions that we have now'. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at least one of those directors has said regulation isn't for the protection of the public. It is for the protection of the occupation to be regulated. I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the need for this Bill doesn't lie with the public. It lies with the occupation. I would further suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, those carpenters that the Sponsor of this Bill mentioned will be grandfathered in, and they will continue the abuse to which he suggests they are guilty. I suggest that the preferable procedure with respect to the regulation lies with the medical profession, and it lies with peer review. That will be far more effective and less costly. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I think if you consider what Representative Garmisa said, and if you

think about some of the things that involve the former Member of this House, and if you had a chance as I did and one of the few people probably here to read the draft of a potential book by that Gentleman about the trials and tribulations that he went through in being fitted for an artificial limb, and going through the trauma potentially even of nearly committing suicide, you would realize the need to regulate an industry that has absolutely no regulation. People in this situation, if you read about it, who lose limbs are in situations where psychologically they can't cope. It is absolutely necessary that this industry be regulated. Put aside the idea that any regulation is bad. Put aside the idea that every possible regulatory Bill somehow flies in the face of free enterprise. We're not talking about free enterprise. We're talking about peoples' bodies, and peoples' minds, and the need to do something with an industry that has had absolutely nothing done with it. The only two people who seem to know about this Bill, Representative Garmisa and Representative Hallstrom have stood up here and told you from personal experience of their own and their close friends that we've got to have this piece of legislation. Representative Garmisa has worked for years to put this through. He wouldn't call it. You know Sparky that well unless there is an absolute need for the legislation. Let's put some green votes there and get off the idea that any regulation is bad regulation because this is absolutely necessary."

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

take the record. On this question there's 85...86
'ayes', 61 'no'. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Will you poll the absentees please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees. Representative
Schlickman."

Schlickman: "If this reaches 89 I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, 'aye'.
Friedrich. Representative Watson, 'aye'. Ewing,
'no'. Bullock, 'aye'. Jones, 'aye'. McCourt, 'no'.
Karpel, 'no'. Macdonald...Representative Macdonald,
turn her microphone on."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I only want to say that
I had my light on for some time to speak, and I was
not recognized which is indeed unfortunate because I
have personal experience with this particular Bill,
and I would like to have been able to speak...to have
spoken on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar, 'aye'.
Representative Yourell, 'aye'. Representative
Winchester, 'aye'. Now what's the count? ...92
'aye', 63 'no'. Piel...what do you want,
Representative Piel? Representative Piel requests
permission to be verified. Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Beatty, Greiman,
Hoffman, Hudson, Klosak, Kucharski, Laurino, Peters,
Pullen, Richmond, Telscer, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll of the affirmative, yes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, Barnes, Bell, Bianco, Birchler,
Bradley, Bullock, Capparelli, Capuzi, Catania,
Chapman, Christensen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Representative

Skinner."

Skinner: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have just been handed House Calendar...Supplemental Calendar Seven. It is marked 11 p.m., and it is quite obviously not 11 p.m. It is 11:20 p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I'll mark it. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Collins, Conti..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I would like to invoke Hanahan's rule."

Speaker Redmond: "You'd like what?"

Schlickman: "To invoke Hanahan's rule. Everyone be in their seat and raise their arms."

Speaker Redmond: "Everybody be in your seat. Representative Walsh, be in your seat. Well, that's the first exception. Representative Deuster, in your seat. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Cullerton, Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Epton, Farley, Flinn, Virginia Frederick, Dwight Friedrich,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger desires to be verified. Is that alright? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines, Garmisa, Giorgi, Goodwin, Griesheimer, Hallstrom, Hanahan, Hannig, Henry, Huff, Huskey, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Keane, Kelly, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska, Kulas, Lechowicz, Leon, Macdonald, Mahar, Margalus, Matijevich, Matula, Mautino, McAuliffe, McBroom, McGrew, McPike, Meyer, Murphy, Oblinger, O'Brien, Patrick, Pechous, Piel, Pierce, Polk, Pouncey, Preston, Rea, Robbins, Ronan, Ropp, Schisler, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Slape, Steczko, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Taylor, Tuerk,

VonBoeckman, Watson, White, Williamson, Winchester,
Sam Wolf, Younge, and Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Schlickman,
any questions?"

Schlickman: "Representative Capparelli.

Speaker Redmond: "Capparelli...wait a minute. Campbell,
what is it you wish?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Campbell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote Campbell 'aye'. Woodyard, 'aye'.
Proceed. Representative Schlickman...Representative
Alexander, 'aye'. Richmond, 'aye'. Beatty, 'no'.
Vinson, 'aye'. Schlickman, any questions?"

Schlickman: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Doyle here? He's in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Farley, he's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Redmond: "Flinn is back there."

Schlickman: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Garmisa is in the aisle."

Schlickman: "Representative Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney. Stearney to
'aye'. McMaster, 'aye'."

Schlickman: "Representative Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Griesheimer in his seat? How is
Griesheimer recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Redmond: "Christensen...how is he recorded?"

Representative Schraeder, 'aye'."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Christensen is not in his seat. Remove

him. You're not in your seat. Representative Christensen is in the chamber."

Schlickman: "Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Redmond: "Cullerton...he's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Jaffe here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Redmond: "Huff, how is Huff recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Lechowicz? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Redmond: "Margalus here? How is he recorded? He's

here. He's here. Way in the back."

Schlickman: "Representative Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Mautino here? Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "McAuliffe. Who was that?"

Schlickman: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "McAuliffe here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Lechowicz has returned. Put
him back on."

Schlickman: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Wait a minute. McBroom."

Schlickman: "Where?"

Speaker Redmond: "I thought you said McGrew."

Schlickman: "McBroom."

Speaker Redmond: "Is McBroom here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Oblinger."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger requested
permission to be verified earlier."

Schlickman: "Oh, she got permission. I'm sorry, Mr.
Speaker. Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "Is O'Brien here? He's here. He's in his
seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Piel here? I think he was verified
before, wasn't he?"

Schlickman: "No, he wasn't."

Speaker Redmond: "I think he was, Mr..."

Schlickman: "Was he? I'm sorry, I guess he was. I

apologize. Representative Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Pierce here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Polk here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler here? He's back there."

Schlickman: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Slape here? He's down up front here."

Schlickman: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "Steczko, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Winchester."

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

Daniels: "From 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Daniels, 'aye'. Representative...Neff."

Neff: "From 'no' to 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "'No' to 'aye'."

Schlickman: "Representative Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Winchester. He's here. McAuliffe has returned. Put him back on. Representative McAuliffe, 'no'. Pierce, 'aye'. Put him back on."

Schlickman: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Sam Wolf is here."

Schlickman: "I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? 93 'ayes', and 57 'no'."

The motion prevails. And the House does adopt the

first Conference Committee report to House Bill 2710. 3535. 3535, Representative Terzich. Representative Doyle, pardon me."

Doyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to concur with the Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3535. Everything in this Bill was the same in House Bill 1125 which sailed out of this House by a big vote, and I just move to concur with this report. And this is no cost to the state."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is on the Gentleman's motion...that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3535. 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 110 'aye', and 25 'no'. The motion prevails, and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3535. 1812. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that has been discussed at great length and because of the lateness of the hour..."

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

Jones,E: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Conference Committee are we operating on at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "What Conference Committee report?"

Jones,E: "Yeah, what Conference Committee report?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "well, Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask leave to take up the revised report and the revised report has been

on the desks since 9:00 this evening. It wasn't very clear and because it's such a controversial Bill I'd ask for the Bill to be reprinted. And that has been on the desks for quite a while."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones,E: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two Conference Committee reports. I have one that is revised and I have another which is...which is considered the first Conference Committee report. Now, I understand.... I understood the Sponsor to say that the first Conference Committee report was unclear but I have both Conference Committee reports in front of me and the substantive language in the second revised Conference Committee report is totally different than the first Conference Committee report. So I believe the Sponsor is trying to mislead us."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Representative Barnes has asked leave to consider the..what is it? The second...the revised..."

Barnes: "The revised report, Mr. Speaker."

Jones,E: "Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor...out of the Sponsor's own words just a few seconds ago, she indicated that the first Conference Committee report was unclear. Now I have both Conference Committee reports in front of me but there's something in the language that has changed drastically, Mr. Speaker. So it's not a question of the Conference Committee report being unclear."

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

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor of this Conference

Committee report indicated that there was an error by the Clerk's Office in the first Conference Committee report and the revised one is correct and she's made a motion, or she's requested leave and I would ask that that motion be put."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the alleged technical error that has been discovered by the Clerk's Office is rather substantial. If you look at the language changes, we have gone through a metamorphosis of a proposal by not having approached that Bill on the floor. So what has happened, although there certainly are some technical errors, the Sponsor has made substantive language changes. It is my understanding that the Members of the Senate have rejected similar situations that we now find ourselves in, and that is, a substantive change has been made, it has been circulated and now we have before us exactly what Representative Jones is alluding to, two Conference Committee reports. One identified as revised with substantive changes and one with technical errors and I think, in order to make it clear to the Membership which of these Bills we are...which of these Conference Committee reports we are dealing with, it seems very evident that we have to make a whole new effort to clarify the problem before us. I think we are out of order to consider this at this time and I would certainly object."

Speaker Redmond: "It would be out of order but she asked leave to consider it. Now that...that motion will be put and if it carries with 89 votes, then leave will

revised Conference Committee report has substantial substantive language changes in them, wherein the Membership does not even know what they are voting on. And I consider you a fair man, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "That's why it's up to the House to make that choice. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have opposed this Bill throughout. However, we've allowed a number of people to look and use revised Conference Committee reports today and in the past on a number of occasions. I think that this or any other measure ought to go up or down on its merits. As I said, I'm not for it, but I think that Representative Barnes ought to have the right to call the revised edition of the report whether you're for the Bill or not. You can express that when we get to that measure. I vote 'aye'."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry and the inquiry is, what is the position of this House if the other House has refused to accept the same program that we have?"

Speaker Redmond: "Automatically killed and it goes to a second Conference Committee."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess that's the position we're in."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 86 'aye', and 56 'no'. Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman, for what

purpose do you arise?"

Hoffman: "Go ahead."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees. Representative Schoeberlein, 'aye'. Well, I know it's the motion."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Alexander. Anderson..."

Speaker Redmond: "Anderson, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Balanoff. Bower. Bullock. Catania. Daniels. Dawson. Donovan. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Greiman. Huff. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Molloy. Mulcahey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Molloy, 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Patrick. Pouncey. Richmond. Skinner. Slape. Taylor. Vitek. Willer. Williamson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vitek, for what purpose do you arise? Vitek, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Williamson. Woodyard. And, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard, 'aye'. Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, one of the staff just went over to the Senate, and this...it passed with 35 'aye' votes. I think there was just a misinformation given before."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? There's 100 'aye'. Wait a minute. Everybody be quiet. 90 'aye'...90 'aye', and 56 'no'. And Representative Jones has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Breslin. Breslin, 'aye'. Oblinger, 'aye'. Ewing, 'aye'. Donovan, 'aye'. Brummer, 'aye'. Representative Jones, again."

Jones,E: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know several Members have Bills on the Calendar they want to be

be granted. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you've had an opportunity at these two Conference Committee reports, but they are substantially different. It would appear to me that what we're actually looking at is a second Conference Committee report which is being foisted upon us as a revised report of the first Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, then the Body can deny her leave. It's in the control of the Body. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Representative Barnes to close. You'll be called on to explain your vote. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, can I ask now...?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the motion, as I understand it, is for leave to consider the revised Conference Committee report. And that requires 89..."

Barnes: "I move adoption of that please. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "On that question, those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Jones, to explain his vote."

Jones, E: "Mr. Speaker, I have always considered you a very fair individual. Now, you have sat through an analysis of the first Conference Committee report for the Membership to consider. The second...the second

called before 12 o'clock. So I will withdraw my request for a verification, because I believe the will of the House will beat this Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I call for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. What is the count? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I have in my hand here, three Conference Committee reports,, all called the First Conference Committee report, and there seems to be a great deal of confusion here on..on whether..on which one the motion is that we consider. Which of the three?"

Speaker Redmond: "The revised one."

Brummer: "Well, it appears that we have two revised ones."

Speaker Redmond: "Two of those...bring it down here and the Parliamentarian will show you."

Brummer: "Well, there are two other people here that have the same question, and I'm just wondering which one it is."

Speaker Redmond: "The one that had no caption at the top was reprinted. And that is the revised one. Representative Hoffman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed. We'll get to your points of order after we've had the verification. Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Oblinger requests to be verified. Mr. Hoffman...Representative Matijevich requests leave to be verified. O'Brien requests leave to be verified. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Abramson. Anderson.

Barnes..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters desires to be verified. Chapman...Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Record me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell, 'aye'. Where are we now? Here is Representative Chapman. Mr. Jones, that's Representative Chapman in the middle aisle. May she be recorded as 'aye'? Okay, proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Leverenz? How do you vote, Representative Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "Record me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk Leone: "Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bradley. Breslin. Brummer. Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey. Chapman. Christensen. Collins..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "My eyes are quick, but not that quick."

Speaker Redmond: "Go a little slower."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative; Cullerton. Darrow. Davis. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan..."

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

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recorded as 'no' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Lady as 'no'. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as 'aye' and verified, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, 'aye', and may he be verified? Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Doyle. John Dunn. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig..."

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

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we're trying to verify the Roll Call, and the Clerk is proceeding too rapidly."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he's your Clerk...He's the Assistant Clerk and he's appointed by your party."

Schuneman: "Well..."

Speaker Redmond: "Why, would you go slower?"

Schuneman: "I think he'll follow your direction, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He never has before."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative: Harris. Henry. Hoxsey. Huff. Dave Jones. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lecnowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. Meyer. Molloy. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Preston. Ronan. Ryan. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Simms. Stanley. Stearney. Stuffle. Telcser. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyn. Vinson. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Watson,. White. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bell, 'aye'.
Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, record me as voting 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Mulcahey, 'aye'. What's the count, Mr.
Clerk? 95 'aye' and 56 'no'. Representative Willer."

Willer: "Please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers, 'aye'. That's
96. Representative Ray Ewell, 'aye'. 97. Ray Ewell.
It's getting to that time of year. 98. Any...Any
questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?
Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Ewell: "Record...I was recorded as 'present'. And I'd like
to be recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Ray Ewell, 'present'. Representative
Hoffman. Daniels, take your seat. Campbell, sit
down.. sit down."

Hoffman: "Beatty. Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Reilly, sit down. Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, would you change me from 'no' to
'present'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change him from 'no' to 'present'. No
more changes until the verification is completed and
nobody added to the Roll Call till it's completed. Go
ahead, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "...me on..Oh."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Hoffman: "I said it would be helpful if he turned me on.
It's hard for me to ask questions if I don't have the
microphone on because it's hard for people to hear."

Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. He's here."

Hoffman: "Representative Dunn. John."

Speaker Redmond: "John Dunn here? He's up in the balcony."

Hoffman: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Farley here? He's here."

Hoffman: "Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Garmisa here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Margalus desires to be
verified. Is that all right, Representative Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Yes, it is. Margalus. Check Margalus off.

Representative Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Griesheimer here? He's here."

Hoffman: "Representative Hannig."

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

Hoffman: "Representative Hannig. Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Lechowicz recorded?"

Clerk Leone "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hoffman: "Representative Leon."

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

Hoffman: "Representative Leon."

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

Hoffman: "Okay. Representative Madigan."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Madigan recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he in the chamber? Garmisa's returned.

Put him back on the Roll Call."

Hoffman: "Representative Nadigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Madigan. Is he here? Remove him."

Hoffman: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is McAuliffe here? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hoffman: "Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Madigan is here. Put him back on."

Hoffman: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew here? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hoffman: "Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Lechowicz returned. Return Lechowicz to the Roll Call."

Hoffman: "Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan. Oh. Okay. Representative Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Hoffman: Representative... Representative Terzich. Okay. I see him. Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "VonBoeckman here? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hoffman: "Representative Watson. Oh, I see him. I'm sorry. I see him there. Representative Matijevich had requested verification. Is that right, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Hoffman: "Representative Bowman is recorded. Representative Younge. Representative Younge. Representative Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge here? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're..."

Hoffman: "Representative Harris."

Brummer: "...verification. There are people working in the aisle over here on other Bills that have nothing to do with it. They have no right to be on the floor, and I ask that they be removed from the floor as the rules call for."

Speaker Redmond: "All unauthorized persons leave the floor."

Hoffman: "It's very difficult.. very difficult.."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be in your seats."

Hoffman: "It's very difficult for me to verify, Mr. Speaker, with all the activity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, will you please record me as 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye'."

Hoffman: "Representative Telcser."

Speaker Redmond: "Cullerton?"

Hoffman: "Representative..."

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

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, if this Bill was called for a vote after 12 o'clock, how many votes will it need...?"

Speaker Redmond: "107. 107."

Cullerton: "Well, it's just before 12 o'clock now. Has the Bill not been called prior to 12 o'clock?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. It would require 107 votes if it's passed after..."

Cullerton: "If the Bill is called prior to 12 o'clock, doesn't it only take 89 votes?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, no. No. If it's passed...The time it's passed. Representative VonBoeckman. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in responding to Representative Cullerton, did you intend to state that after 12 o'clock it would require 107 votes for immediate effectiveness rather than a later effective date?"

Speaker Redmond: "Prior..."

Madigan: "I believe it's correct if it passes."

Speaker Redmond: "In the language...in the language of the Bill, at the present time, it 's my understanding that it would take 107 votes. But that's kind of academic. We're on the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Don't worry about that. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Harris recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hoffman: "Representative Goodwin."

Speaker Redmond: "How's Representative Goodwin...Goodwin here? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. I don't think we took him off. Did we take VonBoeckman off? We took him off? Put him back. Put Vonboeckman back on."

Hoffman: "Henry. Representative Henry."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Hoffman: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe has returned. Put him back on."

Hoffman: "I verified Representative Huff. I'm sorry. All right. I verified him. Mr. Speaker, Jack Davis. Representative Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Look behind you and see. Is Davis here?

How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer, 'no'. I don't think they took you off. How many? Who? Representative Bus Yourell wanted 'aye'. But Ewell wants 'present'. What's the count? Representative Huskey."

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

Speaker Redmond: "'Present'."

Huskey: "Would you change me to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Return him to 'no'. Representative Skinner, 'aye'. David. Representative Barnes."

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

Speaker Redmond: "96 'aye', 56 'no'."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to go with the Bill now, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. And I had a note from the Senate Sponsor and it did pass by a vote of 35 to 20 over there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew, for what purpose ...Representative Jones. 97, wasn't it? 97? 96 'aye', and 56 'no'. And the motion prevails. Representative Jones."

Jones,E: "Mr....Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a staff analysis of the First Conference Committee report and since there have been substantial changes in this, and I know our staff hasn't had the time to give an analysis, maybe the Sponsor can tell us what are the substantive changes that have been made in here which

our very good staff has not had time to analyze for us on this side of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "We're going to stand at ease here for a couple of minutes. Representative Frederick. Representative Frederick. Representative Virginia Frederick."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which the First Conference Committee report on House Bill 3535 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "You've put your motion. Wait till I get the Parliamentarian up here. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the work load we've got in front of us, does it make sense to stay here any longer? Shouldn't we adjourn till some hour tomorrow morning, or this morning rather?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not yet."

Flinn: "How long then?"

Speaker Redmond: "We will tell you in due course. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, was that...was that motion that Mrs. Frederick just made in order? If it was, I'd like to be recognized for a..to move that that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Well...Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we are now in a different Legislative Day and that motion would have to be made in the same Legislative Day. It is now past midnight so it's a different Legislative Day. I don't think that she can make that motion at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We were on the order of Senate Bill 1812. We had not left that order and I ask that you recognize the Sponsor for the motion that she made to move Senate Bill 1812."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I had no intention of putting Representative Frederick's motion right now because we are on the order of Representative Barnes' motion on 1812. We've got another problem though. Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, will you recognize me later then?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, I will. I'm on the order of 1812. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies of the House. As I understand it, if we don't suspend Rule 68-D and E, that we're going to be out of business. Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct. As far as House Bills, are concerned.."

Ryan: "That might not be a bad break for the taxpayers, Mr. Speaker. maybe we shouldn't suspend these rules but I would make the motion that we suspend Rule 68-D and E. Yeah, I would like to explain, Mr. Speaker, that that's for more than this Bill that we're talking about. This is for all House Bills. And after we suspend this rule, it will still take 107 to pass any Bill to make it effective prior to July 1 of next year...."

Speaker Redmond: "Prior to July 1 of next year. That is correct."

Ryan: "You got that? Is that right with the Parliamentarian? So that...that..this motion is not

just in regards to this Bill. It's for 24 hours. Will that give us enough time? Hopefully? All right then, I will move to suspend D and E for 24 hours. That will take us to midnight tomorrow night."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Would you... Mr. Speaker, would you define what each of these rules mean? I mean...Or could it be held up until we get a chance to get our rule book and read it? I usually have them tattooed on my chest, but I forgot to do that this morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, if you'll look at Rule 68 D you'll see that unless we suspend the provisions of that rule, we can't consider either House or Senate Bills. And if we do suspend it, it won't make any difference as far as the Members who make to pass it...It's 107 votes if the effective date is prior to July 1 of 1981. Both House and Senate Bills. Representative Kane. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Point of inquiry. Why does Section D have to be suspended?"

Speaker Redmond: "It requires everything to be on the desk for a full day after June 30th."

Kane: "What would be your intent then? To go back to the one hour limit of June 28th and June 30th?"

Speaker Redmond: "Right...Right.."

Kane: "Could that be specified in the motion? Because if
that Section
is suspended
all
together, we
could be

voting on
Conference
Committee
reports that
have not
been
delivered or
anything."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, will you accept an Amendment to your motion, Representative Ryan? With the one hour provision with respect to Supplemental Calendar and Conference Committee reports?"

Kane: "And for Amendments and Conference Committee reports."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah. Will you accept that Amendment, Sir? He indicates that he will. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, should we not really, if we're going to suspend E, do it for a certain period of time? Otherwise..."

Speaker Redmond: "24 hours is the motion."

Jaffe: "24 hours? All, right, fine."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Ryan's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I don't really... I didn't really catch all that Representative Kane said in regard to his Amendment. And I would appreciate, in explaining his vote, if he would clarify that for me and perhaps some others."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Yes, if Section 68 D were suspended completely then

there would be no requirement for Conference Committee reports or Calendars to be on our desks for any period of time. So the Amendment was that we would use in the next hour the same limit that applies from the time June 28th to June 30th, which is a one hour deadline. So the Conference Committee reports and Calendars would have to be on our desks for one hour prior to the time they could be acted on."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Kane: "For..yes."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye', and 11 'no'. And the motion carries. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think that action should have been taken on June 30th. This is July 1 and that rule specifically says at that point, all Bills are tabled. I think you've got to take them from the table now."

Speaker Redmond: "This has always been the custom, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'm not worried about the custom, I'm worried about the rule. The rule says that as of the end of June 30th, they're tabled. I say to you, that you have to take anything else from the table."

Speaker Redmond: "well, just in the event that you're right we'll make a motion to take them from the table as we ...all the House Bills. Those in favor...Representative Hoffman. If you fellas want to stay here or come back in June or July or August, it's all right with me. We've got a lot of things that have to be done here. We've got ourselves into kind

of a pickle because you didn't call the Bills as we were going along. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To take a Bill from the table takes 107 votes?"

Speaker Redmond: "The only ones that are tabled are the House Bills so it's 107 votes on that."

Hoffman: "The Senate Bills would not be on the table?"

Speaker Redmond: "We don't have control of those. So they're not on our..."

Hoffman: "What about the Conference Committee reports? Those are on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 107."

Hoffman: "Conference Committee reports?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any House Bills."

Hoffman: "Well, then, a Conference Committee report takes 107?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Hoffman: "All right, how does a Conference Committee...what is the position of the Conference Committee report now on Senate Bill 1812?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's a Senate Bill, I guess. Isn't it?"

Hoffman: "Senate Bill, but it's a Conference Committee and it's on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Only House Bills are on the table."

Hoffman: "Conference Committee reports are not on the table?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not on the Senate Bills."

Hoffman: "Where are they?"

Speaker Redmond: "Alive and well, but it will take 107 votes to pass them."

Hoffman: "It will take 107 votes to pass them under any

votes. Now, the Conference Committee report indicates that there's an effective date of June...of January 2, 1981. Now, what action do we take in this House because the effective date is January 2, 1981 and the Senate vote was only 35 votes. Which made it effective January 2, 1981."

Speaker Madigan: "The t.v. lights have been turned off."

Jones,E: "Say what, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "The t.v. lights have been turned off."

Jones,E: "That's for your benefit."

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian informs me that the motion to adopt the Conference Committee report will require 107 votes. Because there's an effective date of January in the Bill, which occurs after July 1, which is today. The Chair has rendered its ruling. For what purpose do you arise, Mr. Ewing?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, to be effective immediately, does that not mean that the Bill will not pass without 107? What if it gets 89? Is it going to be effective January of 1981 or whatever the effective ...later.."

Speaker Madigan: "If the motion fails to receive 107 votes the Sponsor of the Bill should take the Bill back to a Second Conference Committee and adjust the effective date of the Bill."

Ewing: "And then it will still require 107 to be effective before that?"

Speaker Madigan: "If they wish an effective date before July 1, 1981, it would require 107 votes. However, if they wish an effective date of July 1, 1981 for a later...A Second Conference Committee report would require 89 votes."

circumstances?"

Speaker Redmond: "To have..have an immediate effective date.
An effective date after July 1 of next year, 89
votes."

Hoffman: "Would you repeat that again, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "If a...."

Hoffman: "I will come back...Forget that, I will come back
on 1812 another time."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, the motion was presented by
Representative Ryan, the Minority Leader, was to
suspend Rule 68-D and E. And E is the provision that
provides for tabling the Bills, as I understand it.
And so the point raised by Representative Friedrich
should not be a concern because we have suspended that
already. We've taken care of the problem."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll worry about Representative
Friedrich's motion in due course. We're on 1812 at
the present time. Representative Jones."

Jones,E: "A question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Dawson on 3047. Mr. Capuzi. 3047.
For what purpose does Mrs. Barnes arise?"

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I had intended to go ahead with Senate
Bill 1812 and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "Senate Bill 1812. Mrs. Barnes."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Jones."

Jones,E: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the
Chair. Are the Senate passed this piece...the
Conference Committee report on June 30th with 35

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, one other inquiry. If the Bill receives less than 89 votes, it cannot then go back to the Second Conference Committee. Is that right?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, it can. Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Point of Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I understand that Representative Ryan previously suspended Rule 68-D and E. What posture does that leave these specific Bills in if in fact those...that motion carries?"

Speaker Madigan: "The motion did carry. The Bills are available for consideration."

Meyer: "Doesn't it also affect suspend the effective 107 ruling?"

Speaker Madigan: "No. That's provided in the Constitution. Mrs. Barnes on Senate Bill 1812."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "The motion is for the adoption of the First Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1812. Is there any discussion? Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Now, Representative Barnes, would you clarify some of the elements of, I think, what is the revised report. Right? Can you explain to us the references...references to the 100% mandate. Is that still in there? Or is that in there, I mean? The 100% funding? Mike, I can't hear. Do you want to gavel a little bit? She can't hear."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Members give their attention to Mr. Schneider?"

Schneider: "All right. On the revised Conference Committee

report #1, can you explain the language that is in existence and that is in the 100% reimbursement for transportation?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mrs. Barnes."

Barnes: "The reason for the clarification in the revised report was because Representative Yourell didn't think that the language was clear enough to reimburse the local school districts. So the language now reads. 'The State Board of Education shall advise each School District, not later than April 15, of the maximum amount to be available for the second installment of reimbursement for that district.' If such an amount is not available for the 100% reimbursement, the transportation could be terminated."

Schneider: "But it's...it's 100%. Right, Jane?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Schneider: "All right. Now what happens on April 15th when it occurs to the district that 100% will not be forthcoming? Do they terminate the services as they are outlined under a contract, which has obviously been written, let's say, in a district that has the bussing provided by a private carrier, do you terminate the services on April 15th of that contract? That's one of the problems. And do you also then stop bussing children who are nonpublic children?"

Barnes: "According to the language of the Bill, you would stop the transportation of the children. I don't think that would affect the transportation of the nonpublic..of the public schools, however."

Schneider: "I didn't ask that. I'm concerned now at this point, presuming that this is a value to you, the

impact on April 15th is then basically to stop transportation of nonpublic children because we have realized that they will not be 100% funded. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "That's...I'd like Representative Yourell to help me out because he was very interested in this particular portion of the Bill and that was the reason for the revision, so that the language would be clear and that the local School Districts would be reimbursed properly. Representative Yourell, would you help me out?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Yourell, do you wish to answer the question? Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When we were discussing the original...the language in the original...Conference Committee report it seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, may I have some order? I can't hear. There's an argument going back here. It appeared to me, and I had conversations with Representative Barnes and staff and later with Senator Geo-Karis and tried to develop language that would make it crystal clear..."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Members please give their attention to Mr. Yourell?"

Yourell: "In conversations later with Senator Geo-Karis,, she prepared for me, language developed by the Reference Bureau that made it very clear and plain in the Conference Committee report that Representative Schneider is referring to that should the state refuse or not reimburse the School District 100%, then the School District could reduce or terminate the services

required to avoid bussing costs exceeding the funds available for reimbursement. The question that Representative Schneider is referring to is that on April 15th, the State Board of Education would advise each School District as to the amount of funds available to that School District for reimbursement. Now, if the State Board of Education did not reimburse or their figures of April 15th would not be an amount reimbursable to each School District in the State of Illinois, then that School District could terminate or reduce bussing so as to comply with the amount of money afforded to it by the State Board of Education."

Schneider: "All right. Now I understand that you are concerned about mandates, but let's look at it in a none vacuum. Either of the Representatives from their var...their districts...at this time we do not fully fund the mandates regarding public transportation. The short fall is offset by local taxes. Now, when we are talking about funding 100% of the nonpublic schools, and not funding for the public schools, the net impact seems to me to be that the way you deal with the public schools is to increase the taxes because the state money is going to be increased propor..not proportionately, but to a great extent in regard to nonpublic. So what you have in this Catch-22 situation is that you may indeed want to have a mandate which is..I recognize again your respect for the problem, but when you apply the law as it is being defined by you and by Representative Barnes, the impact then is to deal with the public schools in such a fashion as to impose a tax levy to offset a short

fall in a system that is already deplorably underfunded. Would you say that's a reading that is accurate?"

Yourell "Well, I can understand the concern that you and others might have relative to public transportation, and I think we all recognize the fact that each School District by statute can levy in its transportation fund up to, I believe, 12% without referendum. Now, I don't know how many School Districts in the State of Illinois are presently up to their statutory levels for transportation for public school children, but I don't think that that situation has anything to do whatsoever with the subject matter at hand. The State Board of Education is not going to fund..is not going to fund transportation for nonpublic school children simply because it has not fully funded the transportation program for public school ...public school children. So I think we have apples and oranges here. That School Board can at any time levy up to its statutory limits. In my School District, the one in which I reside, is only levying five cents for \$100 assessed evaluation when they can without referendum go to 12 cents. now that is, as you described it, a tax increase, but obviously they have no need for that tax increase because if they were not using their full funding for transportation in that School District, they would be considered to have full funding. So those who are up to the statutory limit, and then must go to referendum, then I would say you have an argument. But when you are only levying five cents out of the statutory limit of 12, then it seems

to me that they are satisfied with that situation and their levy of whatever it happens to be in each School District fully provides full funding for transportation for public school children."

Schneider: "The point that is clear, obviously, in your explanation, is that for those of you who are looking at it from irrelevancy as the previous speaker and his remarks, that is a tax increase whether you do it by referendum or not. There are numerous districts in the numbers ranging around 400 that are underfunded at this point, and I think you have to be conscious of the approach that you are using, and that is to segregate the concept of nonpublic bussing from that of public bussing and try to buy that separation in your own mind to come to the conclusion that it will not have an impact. So I am suggesting to the Members, and I don't want to continue what would be an interesting dialogue over a cup of coffee, but the fact is what would happen is there would be an increase, and it would be a local tax increase, and we will be again utilizing those kinds of funds that I think have been denied to public schools. There is other opposition, I'm sure, from other Members. I will end with just a notion that we should oppose the Bill. There are many other concepts we have discussed before, and I will leave the floor for someone else. I solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, everybody knows what the issue is. I move the previous question."

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

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Mrs. Barnes to close the debate."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this issue has been long debated, and I appreciate the patience of the House. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the First Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1812 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Leverenz, to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Certainly one thing that has been bandied about, I don't believe completely true, is the concept of 100% total reimbursement. That has been tossed about for the provision of buses, but has not been considered in the area of insurance costs and liability for the students that do not attend schools in those districts. In fact, they attend...would be attending schools outside of the district, so there would not be any reimbursement for that. Consequently, it is not 100%. There is no provision for interim financing even with the reimbursement program that's presented. How are the School Districts going to do it? I suggest that they'll have to have an increase at the local level. They will have to borrow money. There is no provision for interest costs involved. Therefore, again, not 100% reimbursement. I don't understand why the Sponsor would even consider doing something at this...like

this at this time. We can't afford one School District and run it well, though it is a sad comment on the public school systems that we have. I would think that the Sponsor would finally give up. It's come back nine times. Hopefully, this will be the last. Anyone that would sponsor something that would end up causing any increase in property taxes at the local level is ridiculous. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "It is the intent of the Chair to adjourn after this Bill. It is the intent of the Chair to adjourn after this Bill. This motion will require 107 votes to be adopted. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 84 'ayes', 65 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. And the motion fails. Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Madigan: "The motion is...for what purpose does Mrs. Barnes arise?"

Barnes: "I ask for a Second Conference Committee report, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "It's automatic under the rules. The motion is that we adjourn until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries."

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
 JUNE 30, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0524	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	116
HB-0821	CONFERENCE	PAGE	232
HB-1010	CONFERENCE	PAGE	157
HB-1230	CONFERENCE	PAGE	237
HB-1400	CONFERENCE	PAGE	213
HB-1407	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	241
HB-2710	CONFERENCE	PAGE	247
HB-2823	CONFERENCE	PAGE	164
HB-2955	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	90
HB-2975	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	80
HB-2976	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	113
HB-2982	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	108
HB-3019	CONFERENCE	PAGE	220
HB-3026	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	32
HB-3034	CONFERENCE	PAGE	136
HB-3035	CONFERENCE	PAGE	223
HB-3046	CONFERENCE	PAGE	140
HB-3047	CONFERENCE	PAGE	115
HB-3066	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	66
HB-3067	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	71
HB-3068	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	77
HB-3114	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	78
HB-3153	CONFERENCE	PAGE	226
HB-3160	CONFERENCE	PAGE	34
HB-3179	CONFERENCE	PAGE	180
HB-3208	CONFERENCE	PAGE	139
HB-3271	CONFERENCE	PAGE	130
HB-3429	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
HB-3432	CONFERENCE	PAGE	179
HB-3487	CONFERENCE	PAGE	155
HB-3535	CONFERENCE	PAGE	264
HB-3538	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
SB-0185	CONFERENCE	PAGE	182
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	238
SB-0569	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	216
SB-1404	CONFERENCE	PAGE	179
SB-1480	CONFERENCE	PAGE	217
SB-1510	CONFERENCE	PAGE	10
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	154
SB-1559	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	32
SB-1578	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	27

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 30, 1980

PAGE 2

SB-1624	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	18
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	148
SB-1626	CONFERENCE	PAGE	139
SB-1632	CONFERENCE	PAGE	137
SB-1635	CONFERENCE	PAGE	165
SB-1639	CONFERENCE	PAGE	135
SB-1640	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	177
SB-1664	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	19
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	232
SB-1710	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	178
SB-1713	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	178
SB-1726	CONFERENCE	PAGE	243
SB-1728	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	189
SB-1760	CONFERENCE	PAGE	164
SB-1799	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	19
SB-1812	CONFERENCE	PAGE	264
SB-2000	CONFERENCE	PAGE	136
HR-0947	3RD READING	PAGE	4
HJR-0104	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 30, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	137
SUSPENSION OF RULE 68D AND E	PAGE	280
MOTION - TAKE ALL HOUSE BILL FROM TABLE	PAGE	283
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	294