

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord bless this House in Thy service this day. Amen. George S. Stewart said 'begin the day by offering it and yourself to God. Look at the day as an individual thing which begins and ends with completeness in itself. Then take this thing, this day and offer it to God to be a day for his use'. Let us pray. Almighty God, who art the Beginning and the End of all things; with whom is no variability, only never-ending constancy grant to Thy servants and Members of this House of Representatives the singleness of purpose to serve Thee and Thee alone. May each action of this day and that of every day be in itself a completeness that will stand the test of perfection and not just the satisfaction of man. Guide the hearts and minds of these Thy servants that they may always know that whatsoever they may do is done all for the glory of Thee O God and Thy creation through Jesus Christ Our Lord. Amen. And as today you hopefully plan to adjourn this Session for the summer I wish to express my gratitude for the privilege and honor of having served as your Chaplain. May the Lord bless you and keep you. O Lord make His Face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift up his countenance upon you, and give you Peace, both now and evermore. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Geo-Karis, you're recognized to make those remarks publicly."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I personally would like to thank Reverend Krueger for some very, very logical and philosophical comments that he has made and of course his prayers. And he has made some very outstanding comments



and if we pause to think about them; reflect upon them; we cannot fail but become better persons as a result. And we...

I personally thank you, it's been a pleasure having you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you Representative Geo-Karis and thank you Father Krueger. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 954, Washburn. 961, Dave Jones. 962, Steele. 963, Dave Jones. 964, Dyer. 965, Walsh. 966, Catania. 967, Rayson. 968, Geo-Karis. 970, Hudson. 971, Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "954 is by Representative Washburn? You want to get on your Resolution 954?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read this Resolution, please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 954. Whereas the distinguished Members of the 79th General Assembly conclude their Spring Session shortly, after having deliberated upon the merits of 6,000 pieces of legislation. And whereas the House of Representatives finds that one contributory factor resulting in the smooth flow of legislation lies with the House Republican staff interns. And whereas this past year unlike others the interns assigned to the House Republican staff were diligent, industrious, overworked and unpaid young men. And whereas Ronald L. Gjerde is in spirit and in spite of and not because of his extensive knowledge and background in mathematics has still been able to figure out the state's revenue picture for Republican Members of the Revenue Committee. And whereas Robert H. Newtonson has ably staffed the Agriculture and Personnel and Pensions Committee and has found his upbringing as an Illinois farm lad has been more useful to him than his political science degree from Drake University. And whereas John D. 'Jack' Seymour after long and loyal service to this Body first as a page while he struggled through college and now as an intern on the Appropriations Committee staff has learned that life as a page is not so bad. And whereas Clive M. Toppel



JUN 30 1976

3.

has discovered his University of Illinois law degree has only been of minimal value in his attempt to probe the sometimes unfathomable subject matter as his domain of the House Executive Committee. Therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly the State of Illinois there are most hearty congratulations and accolades be extended to these young men upon the successful conclusion of their internship. And be it further resolved that the Members of the House of Representatives urge the Chamber's Republican Leadership to initiate proper salutary action in the form commensurate with but not limited to the regal, nocturnal repast of an establishment of mutual acceptance. And be it further resolved that we join the House Republican Staff Director in wishing Ron Gjerde; Bob Newton, Jack Seymour and Clive Topol the very best in their future endeavors whatever that might be. And be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to Ron Gjerde, Bob Newton, Jack Seymour and Clive Topol as tokens of our esteem."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn on House Resolution 954."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, certainly it's been our fortune on this side of the aisle during this last busy Session to have with us Ron Gjerde, Robert Newton, Jack Seymour and Clive Topol having those four outstanding gentlemen assigned to our staff as interns. They've done a fine job. They have helped the permanent staff tremendously and certainly deserve a lot of credit for the fine reports that have been issued to our Membership. And from all of us on this side of the aisle, I know from the other side, too, we wish them the very best in whatever the future course may bring to them. Move for the adoption of House Resolution 954."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Gentleman has moved the adoption of House Resolution 954. Those in favor say aye; opposed, no. The ayes have it; the Resolution's adoption...Resolution.... Representative Giorgi. Giorgi."



JUN 30 1976

4.

Giorgi: "House Resolution 961 by J. D. Jones honors Everett and Lulu-belle Ryther for their 50th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 962 by Steele honors Craig Berganon of Lebanon who's going to be on the U. S. Olympic Track Team that's going to compete in Montreal next month. House Resolution 963 by Dave Jones talks about contracts with other offices and merchants in the best interests of the miner. House Resolution 954 by Dyer honors Evelyn Dickason who's been ordained the minister for Christian Education and Children Union Church in Hinsdale, Illinois. House Resolution 965 by Walsh honors the Great American Show Company that's playing in the Lincoln Show nitely in New Salem Park. House Resolution 966 by Catania asks that Miss Louise King Matthews be recognized for her song, Give Me Strength. House Resolution 967 by Rayson honors Sylvia Dennon who's been chosen Village Manager of the Village of Richton Park, Illinois. House Resolution 968 by Geo-Karis honors a former high school coach, Ted Davis, who has been inducted into the Illinois Baseball Hall of Fame. House Resolution 970 by Hudson asks the National Park Service to take better care of the Lincoln Home in Springfield. Clerk, would you read the last Agreed Resolution, House Resolution 971 by Representative Redmond."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 971. Whereas throughout the session of the House Members have been aided by a corp of legislative interns to wit Kenneth Mitchell, Kirk Ruthenberg, Anita Wright and Kurt Granberg, whereas their energy, enthusiasm has been directed and devoted to researching facts on diverse subjects which have needed the attention and understanding of Members of this House. Whereas the legislative interns have worked many hours gaining knowledge for themselves as well, knowledge which we hope will be of value to them when they continue their education and careers and whereas they have diligently studied and retained such knowledge in the performance of such duties and obligations and perhaps have gained some experience not



JUN 30 1976

5.

found anywhere, but in this Chamber and Committee Hearing Rooms and whereas the monetary rewards received by them were not sufficient to allow early retirement to an early daily routine and existence and whereas they truly represent as individuals and as a group of citizens who will have a distinct impact on many others because of their knowledge and demonstrated interest in the processes of State government. Therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we express our appreciation to Kenneth Mitchell, Kirk Rutenberg, Anita Wright, and Kurt Granberg for their important contributions of the work of this House. And be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Resolution be presented to each as a demonstration of our esteem for their service throughout long hours and days of this Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of all of the Agreed Resolutions, but before you put the motion, I'd like to defer to Representative Matijevec for some kind words."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, you know, you always know those people you work with the best, I was going to mention when the Republican Minority Leader talked about the Resolution referring to the Republican interns, how much I respected and appreciated the work of Clive Topol who worked with the Executive Committee. He helped me and the Committee so much, I appreciated it. I've also had the pleasure of working with Ken Mitchell and I know all of the interns worked as hard as he did and in fact, I've been trying to impress upon our leadership that they ought to hire him. Evidently, it's fallen on deaf ears because in January we are going to look for somebody like him, but I want to join with everybody else and the Speaker on the commendation of the interns. Much of our permanent staff here in the General Assembly started with the internship program



JUN 30 1976

6.

and it's a good program and I join with the Speaker in commending the interns."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk. Representative Washburn, do you seek recognition?"

Washburn: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. I would ask that House Resolution 961 be read please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 961. Whereas on Sunday, August 8, 1976, Everett and Lulubelle Ryther will celebrate their 50th Wedding Anniversary by holding an open house at the Third Presbyterian Church in Springfield, Illinois, from 2:00 to 4:00 P.M. And whereas Mr. and Mrs. Everett Ryther of Springfield, a couple who holds a great belief in God and are active members in the Third Presbyterian Church, and whereas Mr. Ryther, a deacon for sixteen years, was ordained on January 27, 1957, and his wife, Lulubelle, recently retired from teaching Sunday School after more than thirty years of service, and whereas Mr. Everett Ryther, former employee of the Sangamon Electric Company where he worked for forty-three years, is presently employed as the Assistant Custodian in the House of Representatives and his wife, the former Lulubelle Blakeman of Tallula, Illinois, was an employee for Illinois Bell for seven years, and whereas the Rythers, lifelong residents of Springfield, were married at the Third Presbyterian Church August 5, 1926, therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, that we congratulate Everett and Lulubelle Rythers on their Golden Wedding Anniversary that we express hope that they will share many more such occasions and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mr. and Mrs. Everett Ryther of 1326 North Sixth Street, Springfield, Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know if I'm in order or not, but I would like to say that Mr. Ryther is one of the finest, most distinguished gentleman that



JUN 30 1976

7.

we've ever had the pleasure of having worked in this House and I, for one, have always appreciated his very kind help and chivalry at all times and I'm very happy to hear that there is this Resolution honoring him and Mrs. Ryther, who's a very charming and fine lady."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, certainly Everett Ryther who is one of the best State employees that this State has. And Everett's done an outstanding job for several years for the people of Illinois, not only for the legislature, but for the people of Illinois. And certainly, we all congratulate Everett and his fine wife, Lulubelle, on their 50th wedding anniversary and wish them many, many happy years together in the future. Thank you. I move for the adoption of House Resolution 961."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 961. Those in favor, opposed, no. The ayes have; 961 is adopted. Representative Giorgi, did you move the adoption of the other Agreed Resolutions? Have we taken a vote on it? In case we didn't, all those in favor of the Agreed Resolutions as moved by Representative Giorgi, indicate by saying aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it; the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Are there further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 969. Hart, et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to strike from the calendar all motions relating to House Bills. All motions relating to House Bills be stricken from the calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion, all those in... you should have done that yesterday..."

Matijevich: "This is not a dilatory motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUN 30 1976

8.

Schlickman: "Isn't it customary at this point not to strike them from the calendar, which has the effect of killing these Bills, but rather either committing them to Committee or putting them on the fall calendar or putting them on the Interim Study Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "In striking the motion from the calendar, they go back to wherever they were at, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "You mean wherever they came from."

Matijevich: "Wherever they came from."

Schlickman: "Okay, so the intention is just that..."

Matijevich: "That's right, that's why I didn't want the other motion, except striking those motions relating to House Bills on the calendar, therefore they remain in their respective Committees."

Schlickman: "Then they'll go back to the Committee from whence they came."

Matijevich: "That's where they're at."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on...Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would amend that motion by adding Senate Bills."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I think that is the proper motion, in order to amend that, and I think I'll have a second over here on my side of the aisle. The second is right here."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman, Representative Daniels, has moved that Representative Matijevich's motion to strike all House Bills on the calendar be amended to include Senate Bills. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker, it's the motions, all motions..."

Speaker Redmond: "...that's correct..."

Shea: "...and to strike all the ones on the Senate Bills, there's only, as I read it, one, and that's mine, isn't it?"

Speaker Redmond: "D. L. Houlihan has 1711."



JUN 30 1976

9.

Shea: "And it will take nothing more than filing them again."

Daniels: "I assume that the same would be as far as Representative Matijevich's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's Amendment. Those in favor of the Amendment say aye. Opposed, no. In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it. You've heard Representative Matijevich's motion that all House Bills on the order of motions be stricken from the calendar. Those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the motion carries. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "So that the transcript is correct, the House Bills aren't tabled, the motions are stricken."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what I said, the...well, maybe I didn't, but the motions with respect to House Bills appearing on the calendar. Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, could you tell me what happened to Bill on #9, that was on the Speaker's table, House Bill 3988, with this motion now prevailing."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it?"

Willer: "Well, I'm not quite sure, that's what I'm wondering, it's on the Speaker's table, House Joint Resolution 108."

Speaker Redmond: "That's the Resolution, the motion in respect to motions, it appeared on page 3, isn't that correct?"

Willer: "But the motion will take all House Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order of motions, all motions on the order of motions with respect to House Bills. Representative Hart, are you getting ready to seek recognition? Good. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope that you will pay close attention to what I'm about to say. The Bills that have been filed that are sitting in the Rules Committee include a few Bills that some of the Members have indicated to the Speaker they might like to have referred to a Committee to hold hearings in Interim Study during the



JUN 30 1976

10.

rest of the summer and the fall. And so the Speaker and the Rules Committee have prepared a form that the Clerk has where the individual Members of the House can request that his or her Bill be placed on Interim Study into a Committee so that the Chairman of that Committee in cooperation with the sponsor would be able to schedule any kind of hearing that seems to be appropriate to the Chairman of that Committee. So if you have a Bill that you would like to move into Interim Study, would you please find yourself to the Clerk or come over and see me and there are forms available that you can fill out and we will automatically by the time we adjourn today, move to have those Bills placed in Interim Study and after assignment to the appropriate Committees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "What would be the status of any Bill that presently is in the Rules Committee if the Sponsor does not file the necessary form of which he just spoke, would they remain with our Committee or would they automatically be tabled or what?"

Katz: "Well I believe, Mr. Kempiners, I don't see the Parliamentarian here, but I believe that they would simply remain in the Rules Committee, that however, is a matter that I would leave to the Parliamentarian, I would say that might be a problem with regard to the forty-five day rule if they are assigned to a Committee and not placed in Interim Study and the reason that we suggested Interim Study is that the Bills would not be...the Bill would not be automatically tabled under the forty-five day rule. I would suggest, however, to you that if you would check back with me, I would be glad to check more specifically with the Parliamentarian as to whether or not the Bills will remain in the Rules Committee or will go back to some other stage in the proceedings."

Kempiners: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I understand the Chairman of the Rules Committee said that there are forms to have a Bill put on Interim Study Committee, I did have a motion on House Bill 3794 to discharge Committee on Rules to put on the calendar on the order of Second Reading, but I'd be very happy to put it, at this time, on Interim Study Committee, do I so move on the floor, or what?"

Katz: "No, Mrs. Geo-Karis, all that you would need to do would be to proceed to the Clerk and get from him the forms that have already been drawn up, now all you need to do is to sign the form or come over and see me and I have a copy of the form, but the Speaker has arranged this as a courtesy to the Members after consultation with the Leadership on your side of the aisle so you don't need to make a motion on the floor, just proceed to the Clerk and fill out the appropriate form and it will be taken care of without the necessity of a motion on each one of those matters on the floor of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Chairman of the Rules Committee would respond to a question, which might clarify this. Representative Katz, I gather that you are speaking as Chairman of the Rules Committee and are not suggesting or committing Chairmen of other substantive Committees on this point as to whether they ...a...these Bills would go to Interim Study, whether there will actually be hearings and active consideration of the Bills. Is my assumption correct, that you have no control over that so that Members who seek this procedure might do so with their eyes open knowing that, sometimes Interim Study has been regarded as slow death and it does take 107 votes to get a Bill out of Interim Study, which is higher than it does to discharge it from a Committee. I'm wondering if you might clarify that point. Do we have an assurance from the



12.

substantive Committee Chairmen that there will be active hearings and consideration and so forth?"

Katz: "As I indicated, Mr. Deuster, in the earlier remarks, the question of whether or not hearings are held and the manner that Bills are handled within a specific Committee is up to the Chairman of that Committee. I would want to make that perfectly clear to you that the Rules Committee has not determined the question of what will happen to the Bill on Interim Study. I would also want to tell you and the other Members that even if a matter is placed in Interim Study that as far as any further action on that Bill on the floor of this House, the Bill will still have to have a clearance from the Rules Committee at a subsequent date. The purpose of this procedure is for those Members of the House who have filed Bills and who would like to try to work out with the Chairman of a respective Committee the hearing or further action within the Committee during the period when we will be out of Session between now and when we return later in the year, but there is no assurance as to what will happen in Committee, that is a matter of the Chairman of that Committee and this does not guarantee that the Bill that you placed in Interim Study will be heard by this House later in the year, that is still a matter that would require subsequent action by the Rules Committee."

Deuster: "Now my second question, you indicated that the procedure would be as follows, you fill out the form, the Rules Committee would send it to the substantive Committee with the understanding it goes to Interim Study, you might work out an arrangement for a hearing or Interim Study, then do I understand that it must go back to Rules again for a determination should we be here in the fall, that it is an emergency. Is that the ..."

Katz: "Yes, there would have to be a clearance in the fall from the



Rules Committee before the Bill could proceed from the Committee back out to the floor for active consideration on the floor of the House in the fall."

Deuster: "Thank you very much, Mr. Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madigan: "Mr. Katz, as I understand your proposal, you are proposing to remove Bills from the Rules Committee to a substantive Committee. Is that correct?"

Katz: "Yes, in Interim Study, in the substantive Committee."

Madigan: "What action will be required to remove a Bill from the Rules Committee to a substantive Committee?"

Katz: "Well what was intended, Mr. Madigan, is that before we adjourn that I would make a motion for all of those Bills in which they would proceed to the Committee on Assignment of Bills and then into Interim Study in the appropriate substantive Committee. As I indicated, after they get to the appropriate substantive Committee, the sponsor would then have to work with the Chairman of the Committee who would make the ultimate decision as to what will take place in the Committee on Interim Study."

Madigan: "Will individual Members have an opportunity to object to the placement of a particular Bill on the list of Bills which are to be moved out of the Rules Committee and into the Committee on Assignment of Bills?"

Katz: "The answer to that is yes, it will be a motion to which anyone could take exception. However, I did indicate to the Members here in response to Mr. Deuster's question that simply sending it into Interim Study will not assure it's consideration in the fall at all, that there will still have to be consideration by the Rules Committee in the fall before the Bill may be moved out of Interim Study and onto the floor for any further consideration."



Madigan: "Well, Mr. Katz, in effect, you are proposing to reduce..."

Speaker Redmond: "...will the House please be in order..."

Madigan: "...in effect, you are proposing to remove Bills from the Rules Committee, an action which has been considered to be extraordinary in nature in this particular Session and I would suggest that you prepare a list of Bills which are proposed to be removed from the Committee and at first, circulate them among the Members of the Rules Committee and seek their attitude on individual Bills."

Katz: "I had intended, Mr. Madigan, that when the Members file their petition to include them on a list and to check those with the leadership on both sides and with each Member of the Rules Committee to see if there's any objection."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Representative Katz?"

Katz: "Nothing further, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order of business now is concurrence, appears Senate Bill 1804. Representative Schuneman." Non concurrence."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Senate removed an Amendment to Senate Bill 1804 which had been attached in the House, for the purposes of discussing that Amendment with them, I would move for non concurrence in Senate Bill 1804, call for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe the Gentleman's motion is that the House do not recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1804."

Schuneman: "Thank you sir, I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion, the question is on this motion. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1804. On the order of Conference Committee Reports, 1514."



JUN 30 1976

15.

Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence with the Report of 1514, it's been worked out almost unanimously by both sides of the aisle and by both Houses and I move it adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Was the Gentleman's motion concurrence or the Conference Committee be adopted?"

Speaker Redmond: "The First Report of the Conference Committee be adopted."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report. Representative Berman."

Berman: "Could we have an explanation of what this does?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Basically, what it does, it was a question of transfer of some funds from Telecommunications from Corrections to General Services and they just couldn't make any headway on it so I finally agreed that we would allow this deletion to be...to remain on the appropriation."

Berman: "There's some \$300,000 involved, the money was, \$356,455 that... a...for revolving funds, Statistical Revolving, Telecommunications, State Garage, and it'll just mean that the General Services won't have these funds, they will remain in Corrections."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I heard everything that Representative Schraeder said. We receded from House Amendment #1, is that right, Representative?"

Schraeder: "Yes. sir."

Ryan: "Okay, then I move to concur in Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Representative Schraeder, does this have anything to do with collective bargaining?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUN 30 1976

16.

Schraeder: "Absolutely not."

Macdonald: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report. Those in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Final action. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 aye and 1 no and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report. 1524. Representative Stubblefield. Stubblefield. Representative Kempiners, aye. Representative Giorgi, 1524?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, is it on concurrence of Conference Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "Conference Committee Report."

Giorgi: "I'm a cosponsor, but I think I'd better wait until Guy gets here."

Speaker Redmond: "Take that out of the record. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, 1936, is that the order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, 1936."

Mudd: "I would move that the House do adopt the First Conference Report on Senate Bill 1936."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may we have the courtesy of having this Conference Committee Report explained to us and told precisely what it does?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, on pink paper and it takes care of all the action that we took on this Bill on Second Reading and Third Reading and what it does, it moves that we concur with Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3, #5, #7, #8, #9, #10, #14, #15,



#21, #29, #31, #32, and #35. Then it also provides that we recede from House Amendments #17, #25, #30, #36, #37, and #38. However, some of these Amendments were technically incorrect and they were added on to the Committee Report to take care of that correction. Is there any specific area that you might be interested in, Mr. Daniels?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Representative Mudd, have you added any projects to this Bill that were not in it through House or Senate Amendments?"

Mudd: "There was one Amendment that was added in the Conference Committee and that was added because it was overlooked in the Senate and they were trying to resolve the problem and they figured this was the best way to do it."

Daniels: "What was that?"

Mudd: "This was for the Dishard State Park. It's been, I think, for two or three years and they put it back in."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you hear it said often, but this is truly the most important Bill that will come before this House of Representatives in this Session. This is the Bill in which we authorize the issuance of Capitol Development Bonds in literally hundreds of millions of dollars. It's an effort to buy for our constituents baubles of enjoyment that they are entitled to and mortgage the future for twenty-five years to secure those goodies. We ought to note here that when this particular Bill was introduced, it contained many legitimate claims for Capitol expenditures by the Department of Conservation, but the Senate, in its imperial and witless manner, slashed most of the Department of Conservation expenditures from the budget, and then the House rather sublimely went along with the Senate's direction in that manner, so we had a Conference Committee and we sent off



JUN 30 1976

18.

tigers into the Conference to try to right the wrong that had been done. But our tigers turned into pussycats. They just rolled over and played dead, it was a hard-nosed poll named Rock that pointed out to them the facts of life and explained about the hog that ate the cabbage and showed them the line where they were to put their signatures on it and they complied. Now I respectfully urge..."

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

Mudd: "...point of order..."

Speaker Redmond: "...state your point."

Mudd: "We had a legitimate Conference Committee and it was, there was input by every Member of that Committee."

Cunningham: "Well Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "...will you confine your remarks to the motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report?"

Cunningham: "I am so confining..."

Speaker Redmond: "...and not may or may not have happened."

Cunningham: "...I just want an occasion to stand up and speak without being interrupted by some clown, now I want to go on and..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative, you are out of order.  
Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "I notice in your Conference Report, you have Dishard State Park. In whose district is that State Park? In whose district is that Park? What district, do you know?"

Mudd: "No ma'am, I don't"

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

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, will you vote me aye please?"

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't started yet. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you. Representative, in your Conference Report,



I can't, you know, with all this confusion..."

Mudd: "Pardon me, I can't hear you Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Can you tell me whether or not, as a result of the Conference Report, you've cut down funds, I mean in an over-all basis?"

Mudd: "Yes, there were funds cut out."

Geo-Karis: "About how much did you cut down? Cut off in other words."

Mudd: "Yeh, we cut out \$900,000 in the Conference Committee."

Geo-Karis: "And that was all that was cut out from that budget?"

Mudd: "Yes, in the Conference Committee."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madigan: "Mr. Mudd, was there an Amendment #30 added to this Bill in the House?"

Mudd: "Yes sir."

Madigan: "What did that provide?"

Mudd: "It provided for bonds, I think, for industrial parks."

Madigan: "Where?"

Mudd: "In Southern Illinois. I think it was a park in East St. Louis sir."

Madigan: "Do you know the amount of the appropriation?"

Mudd: "1.9 million dollars."

Madigan: "So am I correct in understanding that the House added 1.9 million dollars in bond money for the industrial park in East St. Louis and that the Conference Committee removed that from the Bill?"

Mudd: "Yes sir."

Madigan: "Do you know why the Conference Committee removed it from the Bill?"

Mudd: "No sir, they just wouldn't agree on it."

Madigan: "Did representatives of the Capitol Development Board



4444 30 1976

express an opinion on it? On any Amendments?"

Mudd: "Yes sir, they were given the opportunity and they felt that they would have a hard time implementing it and I think the discussion surrounded that portion of it and the leaders decided to delete it at that time."

Madigan: "So that the Capitol Development Board was against the rejection of the Amendment?"

Mudd: "Yes sir."

Madigan: "C.D.B. was opposed to the Amendment?"

Mudd: "Yes sir."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Klosak. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we had this Conference Committee yesterday and I think a good Conference Committee, most everything is in order here and I would certainly concur with Representative Mudd that we ought to adopt this Conference Committee and move on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Schlickman. Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Fleck: "Representative Mudd, I'm always interested in when we have these Conference Committee Reports as to the Members of the Conference Committee, how much of the expenditures and appropriations directly would benefit the Members of the Conference Committee?"

Mudd: "Well...a..."

Fleck: "...now, could you tell me what Members of that Conference Committee are going to receive direct emoluments as a result of their attendance in that meeting and what they are getting out of this Bill?"

Mudd: "No sir, I cannot, but I'll have to speak to that from my vast experience in Conference Committees, this was my first,



Representative Fleck, so..."

Fleck: "...what are you getting out of it? Do any of these Amendments directly benefit your district?"

Mudd: "Yes, there is."

Fleck: "How much money is involved here? Total?"

Mudd: "I would have to say around \$310,000 to my knowledge."

Fleck: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Skinner: "I understand, Mr. Mudd, that we are about \$300,000,000 over the Governor's budget in non general revenue and common school funds. How much does your Bill contribute to that over appropriation?"

Mudd: "Yes, we reduced that by about \$15,000,000."

Skinner: "Are you over what the Governor requested or under?"

Mudd: "No, we are way under."

Skinner: "How..."

Mudd: "...by about \$15,000,000 under."

Skinner: "You are \$15,000,000 under. Then I guess I have to ask, have to search in the Transportation Department's budget to be able to find where we put the pork?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Barnes: "Representative, this Bill came in to the House at a requested amount. What was the requested amount that it came in to the House from the Senate?"

Mudd: "It came into the House from the Senate?"

Barnes: "Yeh, what was the requested amount at that point?"

Mudd: "72.9."

Barnes: "72.9 million?"



Mudd: "Yes sir."

Barnes: "What was the net effect of our adoption of this Bill when it left the House and went into Conference Committee?"

Mudd: "When it left the House and went into Conference Committee we were at about 79.5."

Barnes: "79 or about 7 million heavy?"

Mudd: "Yes sir."

Barnes: "What is the amount that the Bill reflects now after the Conference Committee?"

Mudd: "78.3..\$78,304,460."

Barnes: "Approximately how much is that over the requested amount from C.D.B. in the original request? About how many million are we above the requested amount?"

Mudd: "We're below by 15 or 16 million from the original request sir."

Barnes: "It was reduced where? In the Senate?"

Mudd: "Yes, sir."

Barnes: "It was reduced in the Senate by about 15 million?"

Mudd: "By about 22 million, I believe."

Barnes: "And we put back about...."

Mudd: "...a...about 7 sir."

Barnes: "About seven, so there's a net reduction of about fifteen from the original request."

Mudd: "Yes sir."

Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "One question of the sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewell: "Approximately how much will the debt service cost the State of Illinois out of the General Revenue Fund over the next twenty, twenty-five years?"

Mudd: "I don't have that figure sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

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



JUN 30 1976

23.

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put, all those in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it. Representative Mudd to close."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again I ask that the House do adopt this Conference Committee on 1936."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1936. Those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Representative LaFleur to explain his vote for one minute."

LaFleur: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was hopeful to be able to ask the sponsor some questions because I don't know when I've ever heard somebody that has less knowledge about a Bill that had so much impact to it. I think Mr. Ewell asked a question about what is the cost of the money and there was no knowledge, but I think you can take of what the authorization will be about ten percent a year will be the cost over a twenty-five year period. But I think there are two things that are very interesting when they did not spell out the projects in here of what the C.D.B. had asked for and what was allotted in this Conference Committee Report. And especially in two areas. The first area where Mr. Mudd said that we...that they had reduced what the C.D.B. had requested, and yet, I find that the C.D.B. had recommended \$59,000,000 authorization under State agencies and they had increased that to \$74,000,000. And also in Water Resources, which is a very interesting area, that had been entered by the C.D.B. at \$12,000,000 and that had been increased to \$25,000,000. So I think there has been a lot of things put in here and if this Conference Committee has worked diligently at this and has tried to put together something, I think they should come back and tell us what they have in this package because it is going to have a twenty-five year effect, it's going to cost us



ten percent each year for the dollars put in here and I think there are some projects in here that each Member of the House will be vitally concerned about, especially if they don't have any. I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to adopt this Conference Committee Report. There's been a very full debate on this question. All of us have heard descriptions of the projects which have been included item by item in the Conference Committee Report and we all know from past experience that if we trace the physical location of those proposed projects, we will find some individual Representative supporting each of those projects. But yet, in my mind one of the most important projects, not only to the welfare and the economy of East St. Louis, but to the entire State of Illinois, is an industrial park in East St. Louis, which is designed to provide economic opportunity to those who need it the most, yet we don't find it in the Report and I'm going to vote no until it is in the Report."

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

Ewell: "Having spoke once..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Younge."

Younge: "I'm certainly voting no on this Conference Report because we worked very hard to build an industrial park in the East St. Louis area. And this industrial park, Amendment #30, has been taken out and it should be in there because we need more jobs for people. We run a very very high dependency rate down there and we need that industrial park and if we are not able to get this Amendment saved in this Bill, we will lose our federal grant and I'm asking everybody to please vote no so that we can proceed with this industrial park. I need your support on this. Vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."



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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Will you open up the board? Evidently there's some people...all voting in favor of the House adopting the First Conference Committee Report vote aye and opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Representative Ewell for the second time."

Ewell: "Yeh, well this is sort of a semi-point of personal privilege, the actual figure is \$103, 868,000 for the information of these people and I vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 aye and 64 no and the motion fails and the House does not adopt the First Conference Committee Report, a Second Conference Committee is requested. 1950, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move that the House do adopt First Committee Report on Senate Bill 1950. The purpose of this Report was to clarify the technicalities in the Amendments that were added to Senate Bill 1950 by the House. All we did is redraft and made it one Amendment to correct the language and to insert the various departments. This was signed by all the Members of the, it was a unanimous Report, and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report. Those in favor vote aye and opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Final action. The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 aye and 15 no and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1950. 3820. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House do adopt the First



Conference Committee...a...the Second Conference Committee, I believe, Report on 3820. We, the House agreed to accept the Amendment #1, #1, #2, #3, #4, Senate Amendments. These Amendments are on the fifty percent that has been going on all of the Bills from the Senate. Number two is the change of Civil Defense Administrative Fund to the Federal Civil Preparedness Administrative Fund. Number three is the reduction of \$6,500 to make a total reduction there of...a... total reduction of \$6,500 for Personal Services, Retirement Social Security and Travel and Printing. Number four is for \$85,000 to carry out the purposes of Senate Bill 1950 that we have just adopted the Conference Committee Report for. It's the funding for that aspect of labeling of hazardous materials. And I would move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2 to House Bill 3820."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3820. Those in favor vote aye and opposed vote no. House Bill 3820. The Board is wrong, Mr. Clerk, it should be House Bill. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 aye and 5 no and the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill...a...to House Bill 3820. 1956. Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's a Conference Committee Report for Senate Bill 1524, which is the substantive Bill for the Appropriation Bill 1956, may I have leave to hear the Conference Reports together?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Stubblefield: "The Conference Report, the first Conference Report, Senate Bill 1524 recommends that the House recede from Amendments #3, #5, and #6, which are all of the Amendments



that were put on in the House and for Senate Bill 1956, the recommendation is that we recede from Amendment #1 and #3, which are Amendments that would change the appropriation amounts consistent with those Amendments that are also being deleted and I would recommend that we adopt the First Conference Report for these two Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield? Sir, do I understand then, that as the Bill now stands, Winnebago County is the only county that would qualify. Is that not correct?"

Stubblefield: "Under the Bill and by adopting these Conference Reports, Representative Brinkmeier, the Bill would return to original form and would apply to counties where the assessment was in excess of forty percent and I think you are correct that for practical purposes all we are talking about then would be Winnebago County."

Brinkmeier: "Well Mr. Speaker, then if I may address myself to the...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Brinkmeier: "What he is suggesting then, is that we accept this Report and the net result would be that Winnebago County and Winnebago County alone would be the beneficiary of this legislation. Now I submit to you there are at least nineteen other counties in the State of Illinois that have similar problems as Winnebago did. They are not quite as bad, but nevertheless they were assessing us above thirty three and one third percent and all of the school districts in all of those counties are confronted with the very same problem that Winnebago is and I suggest to you that we do not accept this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I couldn't agree more with my colleague, Representative



Brinkmeier. Let's review what we are doing here if we do this. Amendment #6, which Representative Meyer put on, makes the one, one hundred seventy-six penalty a permanent thing, not a one year thing like we put in for Chicago in Jaffe's Bill, it will become permanent and it can be used throughout the State of Illinois. Amendment #5, Representative Porter, is a roll back, it allows those systems that are assessing over the maximum rate to stay there. They can't use it in computing their formula money, but it is there for them to use locally if they want to tax themselves so be it. Now, let me tell you the counties that are going to lose money if this Conference Committee Report is adopted over a two year period. Now listen carefully, Adams County will lose \$134,186..."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you obtain some order for the Gentleman so we can hear his discussion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. Give the Gentleman order. I don't see that there's been any demuntion in the roar. Please give the Gentleman order."

Anderson: "Will you reset the clock please? Winnebago, \$3,536,000. Bureau will lose \$119,000. Champaign, \$519,000. Christian, \$21,000. Cole, \$17,000. Clay, \$25,000. Cook, \$1,040,000. Douglas, \$115,000. Fayette, \$241,000. Wabash, \$35,000. Saline, \$51,000. Henderson, \$26,000. Warren, \$94,000. Iroquois, \$232,000. LaSalle, \$39,000. Lawrence, \$45,000. Lee, \$153,000. Livingston, \$81,900. Logan, \$14,000. Macon, \$587,000. Putnam, \$3000. McDonough \$45,000. McLean, one of the fellows that signed this Conference Report, \$484,000. Monroe, \$31,000. Peoria, \$1,484,000. Rock Island, \$383,000. Stephenson, \$320,000. Tazewell, \$841,000. Vermilion, \$641,000. White, \$23,000. Whiteside, \$258,000. And Woodford, \$36,000. So I think we all have a stake in this and I think it should



go back to Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker, I have to agree wholeheartedly with the previous speaker, those figures that he quotes are absolutely right. If we are going to help one school district in one county, one township, and with all the governmental units, we ought to help them all. These are large figures, but we passed 990 last year because it was going to be a good thing for the whole State. Now we ought to do the same thing with this, we ought to help all of the people involved, or we oughtn't to help any. Now I think Winnebago County ought to get their money. I'm wholeheartedly agreed with that. But let's give it to the other areas too. We need it just as well. This ought to go back and these Amendments all ought to be put back on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney. Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "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. All in favor say aye, opposed no. The ayes have it; the motion carries. Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, and I think that what we need to do at this point is to assess and review the intentions of this House and what it is that we are trying to do. I don't think there is any disagreement that legislation is necessary because of the passage of House Bill 990. This Bill starts with an amount of \$2,800,000 to take care of counties which are assessing, or which were assessing in excess of forty percent of property value. These are the only counties where they will not be able to offset tax loss through the process of inflation. In our county, we were losing State aid dollars and taking care of our educational problems at home through the process of real estate taxes simply because



JUN 30 1976

30.

we were obeying the law. If the state agency, the Department of Local Government Affairs had been enforcing the law throughout the state we would not have needed House Bill 990 and losses that incur because of a failure of a state agency to enforce the law becomes, I believe, the responsibility of this Assembly. In other counties that the Gentleman mentioned, and I don't disagree that the problems are there, but they're there because local officials did not enforce the law. And the responsibility of the state to take care of those problems is considerably different and wholeheartedly less than the responsibility to the citizens of Winnebago County where the law was being obeyed and we're being penalized for that purpose. Now from the debate I get a consensus that it is the will of this House, at this point as well as in the Amendment stage of the Bill, to take care of all of those problems and if that is true so be it. And a Second Conference Committee perhaps should be established but I think we're in error because what you're doing is cutting in half the amount of money that would go to Winnebago County where the need is absolute and real and where the remedy is beyond our means and where the effect is caused not from a disobedience of the law but an obedience of the law and I would suggest again that we adopt these Conference Reports."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report. Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote in favor of this Conference Committee Report Winnebago County is in a unique situation because we were the only county in the state of Illinois that was following the mandates of the Illinois General Assembly and assessing it what the law said. Our problems are separate from those of the other counties and I would urge a green vote on this light. Representatives Giorgi, Stubblefield and myself as well as the Senator from Rockford have worked on this Bill for a long time and we do need help for our schools in Rockford and I would urge a green vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, it isn't very often that Rockford is on the pan like we hear problems for Chicago, problems for East St. Louis. We've been debating hours and hours about needs for these other cities. Here we've been penalized \$8,000,000 because of our thoroughly efficient assessment practices. I think this is an instance where the second largest city ought to be given special consideration because it's going to create havoc with our school systems and we've been debating school problems here for maybe a hundred hours. And I feel that this General Assembly, I might not change any votes but it isn't very often that Rockford pleads for a just dissertation...or justice here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have no parochial interest in this matter but I was one of the four or five drafters of the formula for House Bill 990 which has created it. At the time House Bill 990 was heard in this House and also in the Senate we, the Sponsors, of House Bill 990 recognized and told this General Assembly that the formula was so designed to solve the problems throughout the state in regard to equity in property taxes. But that there was one county that we couldn't work into the formula, that we couldn't solve...come up with a solution for and that was Winnebago County. It seemed to us at the time, and I think it was the judgement of this Body that creating equity in property taxation was worth the cost of giving a grant to Winnebago County in order to achieve equity throughout the state of Illinois. Now these other Amendments that have been passed on here basically are not needed. The formula will take care of those counties in due time. The fact is that those counties are not losing money as a result of House Bill 990 and the new assessment level. They never had the money so you couldn't lose it. The fact is that the formula allows for slight increases in assessed valuation in each one of those counties. We're talking in a time of grave financial crisis in this state of tacking on an additional four million or five



million dollars to a...an appropriation to a grant to a county that certainly deserves it for the benefit of all the rest of us they indeed deserve that grant. But there is no necessity for other grants to the other counties that are involved. Frankly, one of those counties is in my district but I can tell you that it's unjust and inequitable and it's an expenditure of state funds that we should not incur at a time when we need every dollar that we can find in this budget. I truly encourage you to vote for this; it's the sound and equitable thing to do."

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

Maragos: "Mr...Mr. Speaker I had my light on during debate because I wanted to ask a rhetorical question of the Sponsor of this report. Is the report...have a time limit as to when these...finally going to get release denied them? And I'd like to ask in his explanation if he would tell me otherwise...Committee Report comes out without any time limit of a year or two, given the relief until they settle their...assessment procedures I think it'd be unfair to keep this on for forever."

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

On this question there's 47 aye and 85 no and the House... Gentleman's motion fails. Representative Stubblefield, you request a Second Conference Committee?"

Stubblefield: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I...now..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Second Conference Committee has been requested."

Stubblefield: "...Request that..."

Speaker Redmond: "And that applies to 1524 and 1956, that correct? 3068. 3068. Representative Chapman. Who's the Sponsor of 3068? Representative Chapman. 3068? Who's the Sponsor of...going, 3068, twice. Representative Downs. Out of the record. 3318, Representative Hanahan. Representative Bradley for what purpose do you rise?"

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for the purpose of an announcement. The Members of the Conference Committee on Corrections, Mental Health and Children and Family Services are going to meet in Room 400 at 11 o'clock



and I'd like to read the names of those Members of those Conference Committees. If everybody will be there on time maybe we can resolve the problem with those three Conferences, they all relate to the same problem. On Children and Family Services it's Jaffe, Barnes, Bradley, Ryan and Totten. Mental Health is Byers, Boyle, Totten, Bradley and Ryan. And in Corrections we have Kosinski, Bradley, Brummet, Ryan and Totten. So if those Members will be up in that Room 400 we can proceed with those three Conference Committees. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, out of the record. 3952, Representative Laurino? Out of the record. On the order of concurrence 3147. Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, I'm thinking just in case we're here later tonight, I...I was wondering if we could have unanimous consent to waive that three hour rule relative to the calendar on conference committees. I'm afraid if it's around 9 o'clock that could really jeopardize us."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I object to this time, Mr. Speaker, I see no justification for doing that now."

Speaker Redmond: "Fourth of July in Springfield is very delightful. Representative Madigan. 3147. Representative Schneider. Gene Hoffman. Representative Schneider. Representative..."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last night I think we determined that this proposition needs 107 votes because it does add additional money for school construction bonds relating to special education. That's basically the change from ten million to twenty million. Formerly that money was taken from General Revenue Funds. What we have done is to suggest that now this become money from bond sources for a period of one year. I would ask that this House do concur to Senate Amendment #2, is it? Yes, 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Repeat the motion there?"

Schneider: "The House do concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Any discussion? The question's on the Gentle-



man's motion that the...Representative Berman."

Berman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Berman: "This is the Bill that deals with the shifting of the special ed construction from...from General Revenue to construction? ...Money?"

Schneider: "That's right."

Berman: "And the Senate Amendment does what? Just make it for..."

Schneider: "Senator Brady's Amendment from Chicago adds an additional \$10,000,000."

Berman: "Are you trying to tell me something?"

Schneider: "Yes. That there's no point hassling around on it, just vote it up."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh from Chicago."

Walsh: "LaGrange Park, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "LaGrange Park."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the thing that troubles me about this concurrence in addition to the fact that we're increasing the authorization to issue bonds is the fact that we include in this Senate Amendment the authorization to use bond money for planning, sort of whatever that means. Now it seems to me Mr. Speaker that if we didn't have planning as a...as a justifiable use for bond...bond money before we certainly shouldn't have it now especially since we're issuing more and more bonds. Now for two reasons then I don't see any justification for increasing the state's indebtedness by \$20,000,000 and secondly because the proceeds of this bond money can be used for planning. I would urge a no vote on this concurrence."

Schneider: "I would like to respond. The language is all ready..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Schneider."

Mautino: "Glenn, would you please explain to me the...the last statement in the Digest, the last sentence which says that the



spec education building purposes for the 1976 fiscal year only?"

Schneider: "Well, that has now been amended to include the two fiscal years which would mean 75-6,76-77. What happened is that a local district will levy taxes or will exercise an initiative to construct special education facilities. What we do is reimburse and that's what this money is, but there has to be actual construction under way and a reimbursing formula is created for that which indicates...which will then entitle the district to reimbursement. The new language which is in the Bill is language that is already in the Capital Development Board Act and which is also requested by bonding houses in order to allow the construction to proceed."

Mautino: "Okay. Secondly now, will this take into consideration those buildings that were...those bond issues passed in '71 buildings constructed in '73 and late...late '73 early '74? Would they also be covered under this particular section? I will specifically state let's say, Kewanee High School that put up the special ed building under contract of '71 finished in late '73. Would this apply to their funding?"

Schneider: "My understanding is that it would, Jack, because it's an eight-year program and I think it would go back possibly pick up that if it's money that has been carried forward or for proposals that are still pending."

Mautino: "Your answer is yes, it will pick up that..."

Schneider: "That would be my understanding if that is still in the process."

Mautino: "No, it's completed, Glenn, that's why I asked."

Schneider: "The answer now is yes."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "House Bill 3147 at its outset as I read the Bill and I would appreciate your comment provided that the proceeds from



these bonds could be used for special ed purposes during fiscal '76, is that correct?"

Schneider: "That was it. There's been another year added and another 10,000,000 on top of that."

Schlickman: "Well, now wait a minute. The Bill, as it was introduced, simply said that for fiscal '76 the proceeds of these bonds could be used for special ed purposes. Fiscal year '76 terminates tomorrow. Okay?"

Schneider: "It's reimbursed in money."

Schlickman: "Okay. Then, Senate Amendment #1 expanded the purposes for which the money could be used, planning assistance, added \$20,000,000 from the present authorization of 400...Right."

Schneider: "I think the..."

Schlickman: "And then...and then add and then continue to term for another year, is that correct?"

Schneider: "That's right."

Schlickman: "All right. So we've got an entirely different Bill with Senate Amendment #1 from what we started off with."

Schneider: "We have more money and the concept of planning which I think I tried to explain to Dick was added because the bonding houses suggested it and also because it's already language in the Capital Development Board Act."

Schlickman: "One final question. In House Bill 3148 there is an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for special ed facilities, is that correct?"

Schneider: "Was that mine? 48, I can't recall it. Is that the... House Appropriation?"

Schlickman: "...3148..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your questions to a close, please."

Schneider: "If it's the appropriation, Gene, that's already on the Governor's desk."

Schlickman: "Right, so we got...so now we're up to \$30,000,000."

Schneider: "Well, wait a second, I think..."

Schlickman: "Now what about Senate..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute."

Schlickman: "...Speaker wants to expedite this thing. Senate Bill 1935



also have \$10,000,000 in it, so now we're up to \$40,000,000.

This a shell game?"

Schneider: "This is the authorizing legislation in the...you know, the substantive bill; the \$20,000,000 is presently on the Governor's desk for signing. I think you have...if you're ...you can't stockpile the appropriations on top of the substantive request to make it, you know, under that kind of shell game it'd be 40,000,000. What we're doing is putting \$20,000,000 into the substantive bill to match the appropriations which is 20,000,000."

Schlickman: "Thank you and the Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I...sense a contradiction on the part of the Sponsor. I thought he said that this is a one-year program and yet I think I've heard that we're into two fiscal years already. I wonder if he would yield and explain this rather gaping inconsistency?"

Schneider: "Would you...Cal, I missed that, I'm sorry I was talking to one of the aides."

Skinner: "In the beginning you said this was a one year...a one shot thing that we...because we're short of money this year in the General Revenue Fund we were going to stick into Capital Development Board money which of course costs \$1.73 for every dollar that we spend over the long term and in your answers to Representative Schlickman you said that we were in two fiscal years. Now which is the truth?"

Schneider: "It's two fiscal years for construction and reimbursement purposes but it's a one time appropriation for bonds rather than General Revenue."

Skinner: "How do we know it will only be one time?"

Schneider: "Don't support it next year."

Skinner: "Members of the General Assembly, if I might..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "...You. It seems to me that the best way to make sure it doesn't happen this year is to make sure it doesn't happen... or doesn't happen next year is to make sure it doesn't happen



this year. This is an incredible precedent to set. We are doing it systematically throughout the budget; we are throwing the burden on future politicians to pay for today's bills and next year's bills. And I would like to remind the Sponsor that he is one of those future politicians that's going to have to find the money. He's got his fingers crossed, what does that mean?"

Schneider: "With any kind of luck. Let me..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Schneider to close. Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as one of the Co-sponsors of this Bill, let me just make two or three comments to...to clear the air on some statements that have been made. Number one, this is the authorization bill for the \$20,000,000 that's included 10,000,000 one bill and 10,000,000 in the other bill. So there is no \$40,000,000, it's \$20,000,000 of authorization, there's \$20,000,000 of appropriation. Let me say also that these are for special education facilities and all we are doing in this is treating special ed children the same way we treat other children under the School Bond Construction Act. This is for Capital Development, this is for planning for Capital Development, it's for capital outlay, it is not for operating funds. Thirdly I'd like to point out that the Capital Development Act provides for planning assistance. If we want to save the taxpayer's money and if we want to get the long-term benefit out of these facilities planning in the beginning maybe some of the most important dollars that we spend. So what we have done in this Bill is we have made the language in the School Bond Construction Act to be the same as the language in the Capital Development Board Act. Whether we will do this in the...in the future is up to...is up to us. We have a lapse period, the commitments have been made for FY-76, it makes sense to run these two appropriations together. Prior to this time we have been taking the money out of General Revenue and you and I know



that that type of thing doesn't really make a great deal of sense in the fiscal condition that we are in now. And we... we, as a General Assembly, sustain the elimination of this \$10,000,000 from the...Superintendent of Public Instruction's Office in the past and so for this reason I would encourage an aye vote. I think this is a responsible piece of legislation and I would urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider to close."

Schneider: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly it...it is again a concept that does apply to all schools. We relate to question of construction, I am concerned as everyone else is in regard to bonding, but the fact is building construction out of General money, General Revenue money at a time like this is very difficult and I would suggest that districts that have made their effort and have undertaken construction of special ed facilities deserve some assistance and this is the Bill for that and I would ask an aye vote and we do concur."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3147. All 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 127 aye and 20 no...and 20 no and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3147. 3721, Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I ask...move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3721. It is a clarifying Amendment to clean up language, make the intent of the House Bill more clear and I ask your favorable approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question, the question is on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Berman."

Berman: "Tom, could you tell us in detail what...just what the Amendment does? Or the...yeah, what the Senate Amendment does?"

Miller: "Well, if you recall the Bill are...it allows school districts



to use either the '73 or '74 operating tax rate whichever is greater. Now the Bill that we sent out of the House with that language in it was quite ambiguous and I think if you had your hands on a copy of the Senate Amendment you would agree that it did in fact clarify it in greater detail."

Berman: "Does it still apply to...all of the downstate also?"

Miller: "Yes, Art, the same school districts, no different than... money or who it applied to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question."

Miller: "I'll be glad to take it out of the record if you had any problem but I can assure you that that's all it does."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3721. 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 114 aye and 7 no and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. Representative Lechowicz, aye. Conference Committee announcement. Leverenz, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Conference Committee announcement relating to Senate Bill 1603...."

Speaker Redmond: "Williams, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Members appointed to the Conference Committee are Representatives Kozubowski, Lechowicz, Bradley, Ryan and Totten. Meeting of the Members of the Conference will be held today at 11:30 in the east House corridor. Notice of Second Conference Committee relating to Senate Bill 1936. Members appointed are Representatives Mudd, Madigan, Bradley, Totten and Ryan. Meeting of the Second Conference Committee will be today at 12 o'clock noon in the east House corridor. Notice of Conference Committee Second Conference Committee relating to Senate Bill 1934. Members appointed to the Conference Committee are Representatives Terzich, Sangmeister, Willer, Totten and Ryan. Meeting of the Second Conference Committee will be today at 12:15 p.m. in the east House corridor."

Speaker Redmond: "3810, Representative Kelly."



Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3810. House Bill 3810, as you know, is a Bill which calls for the appointment of two special election judges which would tally retention ballots in judicial elections. Senate Amendment #1 gives the Bill an effective date and Senate Amendment #2 provides for the implementation of a new voting system...a voting machine mechanism into Cook County. It provides for the use of this new machine in the forthcoming election and this measure has the support of both parties to my knowledge. And I don't think there's any opposition to the change. And I move for the concurrence, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Kelly: "Yes."

Catania: "Representative Kelly, you said this provides for a new... you said this provides for a new kind of voting machine in Chicago, is that correct, in Cook County?"

Kelly: "No, these...I mentioned Cook County, we are going to be using these machines in the forthcoming election in the suburban area of Cook County and not in Chicago, so this would not be in your particular district."

Catania: "This does not affect Chicago at all?"

Kelly: "This does not affect Chicago at...at all as far as...these machines will not be used at this present time in Chicago area, yes."

Catania: "Well, would you describe what's going to be happening in the suburbs?"

Kelly: "Sure. Well, in the suburbs we've had these large expensive voting machines which have cost well over \$2,000 for each machine and it'll be replaced by these small box-type machines which will only cost \$200. The downstaters are more experienced and have been using them for a number of years now and have experienced no difficulties with them and this is...is the same type of system that we would institute into suburban Cook County. The



difference is where we had machines in suburban Cook County. Of course in Chicago you had your candidates listed across the top of the machine..."

Catania: "...I was just curious why we're doing it in the suburbs and not in Chicago."

Kelly: "Well, at...at this time, this is where the election system in Cook County determine that they want to experiment with these in suburban Cook County. I don't know, maybe the future will bring Chicago, but for the time being the authorities determine that suburban Cook County would be the area to place these so at this time that's the only place."

Catania: "...Because our understanding are...are large machines that cost over \$2,000 in Chicago are they not?"

Kelly: "They are. They are 2,000 in Chicago."

Catania: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mahar: "Dick, how's the machine differ than the one we had in the primary?"

Kelly: "The...the machine would be a smaller punch card system... it's an IBM system...an...IBM system and it would be well, in...in all reality it'd be a lot...instead of having your name listed three times...Bill, you'd only have your name listed once as a Representative of the General Assembly. And it would be much easier in many respects for the...the voters."

Mahar: "Will this be in effect for the fall election?"

Kelly: "Yes, yes, it would."

Mahar: "Does this Bill authorize..."

Kelly: "In half of the suburban precincts...is it what, Bill?"

Mahar: "Is...in other words is this piece of legislation that you're going to have voted on, is this determined whether we're going to have these machines in half of the precincts or not?"

Kelly: "Yeah, these are only to use the...the less expensive booths to



save money, that's the reason."

Mahar: "I was under the impression that your legislation was designed to alleviate the problem we had with the judges to count the judicial ballots. Now you're talking about legislation to authorize the use of additional machines or different types of machines?"

Kelly: "No, this is the earlier...the, the Bill itself was intended to make the system of counting these judicial ballots much easier. We will place on these machines the new, the judicial candidates that are running for retention and it will in fact save the judges much time in...in tallying and counting these...these ballots so it is very much the same subject matter."

Mahar: "Well, that I'm in favor of...I'm concerned about the other par... I'm in favor of what you're talking about there. I wanted to know how...how it changes as far as your and my names on the ballot are concerned, that was my point."

Kelly: "Yeah, the machines have already been decided by the Board. This is a jurisdiction that they have the authority on just as Representative Catania had asked about Chicago, that's a different authority and it's governed under the City of Chicago Board of Election, that's why they're...so it's..."

Mahar: "Then this Bill doesn't cover exactly the...how your name and my name will appear on the ballot?"

Kelly: "No, it's just the voting booths only."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Can't see Representative Madigan. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm afraid that in the description of this Senate Amendment it may have taken on in the minds of some Members some importance that it really doesn't deserve. The Cook County Clerk, under authority that he already has under the Election Code, has decided to buy and use in the November election Vote-O-Matic voting devices which are already widely in use downstate. All that this Senate Amendment does is to permit a change in the size and the shape of the voting booth to accommodate the Vote-O-Matic machine."



It doesn't authorize the use of the machine, that's already authorized and the Board has already decided to do it and they've already bought the machines. All this does is change the Election Code requirements on the size and shape of the election booth so that those Vote-O-Matics can be used. It's really a very simple technical change in the Election Code and I would urge support for the motion to concur in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "One question and that is if the Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Palmer: "That...the question is whether or not these machines will be used in all the country towns?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, they will be used in all of suburban Cook County, yes."

Palmer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this legislation, As was previously mentioned the Cook County Board has already gone ahead and purchased these machines under the authority they've had. In suburban Cook County we will now have four machines for each precinct. We will have little minicomputers that will tally the votes right in the precinct. Within an hour after the election we should be able to know exactly what happened in the precincts. The storage and moving of these machines to and from the precincts will substantially reduce the cost of elections in Cook County. I think this is an excellent Bill and I commend it to you for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say aye; opposed, no. The ayes have it. All those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Call on you to



explain your vote, Representative Dyer. Representative Dyer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dyer: "Well, it just happened by coincidence I was on the floor of the Senate when this Bill was being discussed and there were two questions raised that have not been answered. One, do these machines, which have already been delivered, match the original specifications as authorized? The second question is, has the Bill been amended to assure privacy for the voters because there's no mention of curtains and...the dimensions of this machine... you'd have to be a midget voting on your knees to have privacy. And I would like an answer to those two questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for one thing those questions were... were not asked in particular during the earlier debate and I'd be pleased to answer them. These, first of all these specifications as I understand do, you might say contain or permit, the size of this machine which will be used. As to the privacy, these have been used in...throughout Illinois for many, many years now and there has never been a question of privacy and that there is a...certainly they are short and down closer to the ground but it would still provide the privacy because they are only some five feet off the ground so it would provide a large degree of privacy just as our system presently is not a hundred percent foolproof but it's fairly well. So I...the feeling of the election officials is that it does provide privacy. Yes, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 aye and 13 no and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Kelly to close."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would just like to ask for your concurrence on the House Bill 3810 of Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2. And I'll just ask for the Roll Call. Oh, incidentally, incidentally, I would like to add that there are some districts in suburban Cook County, as I understand it, that will not be changed from the



present system and I'm sure we'll be able to let those of you who are candidates know which of those precincts are but this is an outstanding system that should serve the State of Illinois very well and I ask for your concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3810. Those in favor vote aye and opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I'm very pleased to see the County Clerk of Cook County has finally acknowledge the value of electronic voting system. In 1965 I introduced the first legislation in this Body to permit the use of electronic voting systems and the 1966 primary we used them in Lake County and have ever since but on the State Election Laws Commission in which I served in 1966 and 67 there was no more hostile person to electronic voting systems and no more vigorous partisan of the old mechanical voting monsters than the present county clerk of Cook County who was in counsel to the Election Laws Commission. I'm glad he's finally come around and realizes the value of these electronic voting systems. Had they had them in Cook County this last spring you could have put all the retention judges on the electronic voting system and not have the big mess you had. I...vote aye to support this."

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

Madigan: "May I explain my vote, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Madigan: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Pierce, in light of your comments I think maybe that I should reconsider my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 aye and 9 nay and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3810. 3068, Representative Downs? You the Sponsor? Out of the record. 3318, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Conference Committee on 3318, the Minimum Wage Law, met and came to an agreement and



the Conference Committee Report there is a technical difficulty that I'd ask leave so that we correct a number from three to four on the employees granting and exemption for coverage. And I'd ask leave and has been concurred with the Senate, both the Republican and the Democratic Members of the Senate, they have already done it in the Senate on their Conference Committee Report. And here in the House I spoke to Representative Tuerk, Representative Deavers, Representative Giorgi, Representative Hill and have agreed that the language 'three or less' or the difference between fewer than three' makes a substantial difference and we have concurred to go to the higher number. And so with leave I'd ask to change a word on line 39 on the Conference Committee Report, the underlined 'number three' change it to 'number four'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "In other words do I understand you correctly, Mr. Sponsor, that if you amend the Conference Report on its face you will exclude an employer employing fewer than four employees, is that right?"

Hanahan: "Right. Right. Right now the way it reads it would seem that it would be two or less and...it was a language difference of opinion and I concur to the higher number."

Geo-Karis: "And when you talk about immediate family, members of the immediate family..."

Hanahan: "That...that has nothing to do...what I'm asking leave for right now. I...I'm asking leave for..."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, all right."

Hanahan: "...Specifically on the three to four."

Geo-Karis: "You want me to wait then I'll ask...okay."

Hanahan: "Yes. And then on the Conference Report."

Geo-Karis: "I have no objections to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan, is the Senate also asking for such leave..."



Hanahan: "They have already done this."

Matijevich: "Oh, they've already..."

Hanahan: "They have already concurred with this change."

Matijevich: "Okay."

Hanahan: "On their Conference Committee Report."

Matijevich: "Thank you, I read..."

Hanahan: "It's really more technical than anything else and I'm going to the higher number."

Matijevich: "I just wanted to make sure they're both the same."

Hanahan: "Yes, they're both identical...and we are granted leave right now. Then I would explain the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I object to giving leave to the amending on the face of a Conference Committee Report. I don't think that there is any precedent or authority for doing this and the better course would be to not adopt Conference Committee Report #1 so that a Second Conference Committee can be appointed including Members of the Senate, of course, and then come up with a Second Conference Committee Report that will change the word 'number three' to 'five'."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "...The Gentleman in his wisdom, or lack of it, wants to object I will ask for it to be taken out of the record and we will reconvene our First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. On Conference Committee Report, Senate Bill 1621. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "That hasn't been distributed yet, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "How about 1650, is that distributed? Senate Bills Second Reading. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "I'm sorry this is the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1621."

Speaker Redmond: "1621, has it been distributed?"

Richmond: "Yes, the first one."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay, 1621."

Richmond: "And I move not to adopt it, Conference Committee Report..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the House do not adopt the Conference Committee Report...Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "I'd like to know why the move...feels we shouldn't adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Because there was a disagreement concerning the ethnic portion of the program and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Board says this is Conference Committee Report #1, Conference Committee Report #1 on this Bill has already been rejected. I think we're considering Conference Committee #2 and if the Gentleman is suggesting that we reject Conference Committee #2, I will join him with great enthusiasm."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, what's the record show?"

Richmond: "Just a minute. This is on a Conference Committee #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this...whether it refers to Second has nothing to do with the point that I raised and that is this Conference Committee has not been distributed and on the Member's desk for three hours and that if you care to, it would seem to me on a nonconcurrence it might be a good idea to ask for unanimous consent to suspend that Rule 68-B on an individual basis. I certainly would not object to that. Another point, Mr. Speaker, that be a benefit to the Members would be to indicate on the calendars which conference committee we're considering; whether it is one or two."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell us which Conference Committee Report we are considering on this Bill? Normally it's on the... on the calendar, we better take this out of the record. Mr. Clerk, will you be sure hereafter that the Conference Committee number appear on the supplemental calendar? Second...Senate Bills Second Reading. Senate Bills Second Reading appears



Senate Bill 1679."

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1680."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1680. This Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1726. Representative Richmond."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1726. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading.



Speaker Redmond: ".....1749."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1749, this Bill has been read a second time previously, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Catania, amends Senate Bill 1749, on page 1, line 7, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania. Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1749 is the same Amendment that received 89 'yes' votes to 33 'no' votes in this House on House Bill 3907. It is the Bill that restores the effective date for household workers, Worker's Compensation inclusion, for July 1977. A compromise between the current effective date of July 1, 1976..... tomorrow, and the proposed effective date of 1980. As I said, this House has already voted to support this Amendment, to give household workers the benefit of Worker's Compensation. It has voted overwhelmingly in support of this Amendment on a Bill which unfortunately was later Tabled. That's why we now need to put this Amendment on this Bill and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Amendment. Senate Bill 1749 arrived in the House late and I had to move to discharge Committee in order that this matter be heard. There was some objection.....raised at that time and Representative Giorgi objected to .....my motion. But those objections have since been removed... when I agreed that one Amendment would be accepted on this Bill but that I would resist all other Amendments. And, in accordance with that agreement, Mr. Speaker, ... I think that the Amendment offered by Representative Catania should find another vehicle and I therefore am opposed to this Amendment."



JUN 30 1976

50.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor of the Amendment would yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Ewing: "Representative Catania, if we don't put this Amendment on, have we passed out another Bill that would make it....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania.."

Catania: "I'm sorry, I didn't have my light on and I wasn't going to be able to answer your question. I didn't mean to interrupt you, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "...If we don't put this Amendment on, when will domestic workers be covered....tomorrow, or 1980?"

Catania: "It depends on whether the Governor signs Senate Bill 1937 or not. If he signs it, then they will not be covered until 1980. Otherwise, if he doesn't sign Senate Bill 1937, they'll have to be covered tomorrow. This was originally offered in the spirit of compromise. However, I think that Senate Bill 1937 was agreed to in another spirit of compromise so we would be selling them out, in effect, and not covering them until 1980, if we don't adopt this Amendment."

Ewing: "So, if we leave it as it is, without this Amendment, it'll either be tomorrow or 1980?..."

Catania: "That's correct.."

Ewing: "...If we pass this, there'll be three choices?"

Catania: "If we pass this, it would be 1977. And, since this was .... latest action taken by the General Assembly... it seems to be the opinion of most of the attorneys that this would be the effective date that we would have agreed on."

Ewing: "Well, I understand, but he could Amendatory Veto either Bill, to take it out or put it in?"

Catania: "Well, there's always that possibility that he can



JUN 30 1976

51.

do anything with his Amendatory Veto that he chooses."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the purpose of this Amendment is obviously to speedup the coverage of household workers by three years. Because I don't think there's any question but that the Governor will sign the first Bill and that if he signs this one it will speed it up by three years by amending this Bill and I would oppose the Amendment. I think we've got to put this off as far as possible."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? Representative Catania, to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do ask for your support of this Amendment. I would take strong exception to the speaker who wants to ask the household workers to wait another four years before they have any kind of worker's compensation coverage. I would point out to you that Worker's Compensation sets up a framework so you know precisely where you stand. If your household worker breaks an arm or a leg, you do not leave yourself open to .... open-ended law suits. And, I think this is good from the standpoint, not only of the household workers who really need it but also from the standpoint of the employer. I ask for your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's Motion to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1749. Those in favor of the Motion vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative Mautino to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'no' on this issue ....for the same reasons that Representative Schuneman has addressed. This Legislation that we have before us now, with



Amendment #2, which will be coming up shortly, will solve the problem of the assigned risk pool, for the employers and employees of the State of Illinois. I recommend most highly, if Representative Catania would like to put her Amendment on....find another home for it.....1847 would be a more proper place. We have given our word that this piece of Legislation would not be used for a vehicle, other than, correcting the inequities in the assigned risk pool. I would hope that this Amendment would not be adopted."

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

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to explain my 'yes' vote. I think this Amendment should go on every possible vehicle. This is a House....and I'm looking at those red lights up there...this is a House that pays lip service to the value of the home and the family and motherhood and keeping families together... and treating old people well...and treating children well. Now, why should not domestic workers, homemakers, household help that makes it possible to keep older people in the home, to keep children in the home. Why should these workers not be included...under Workmen's Compensation ... just as other workers? I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Van Duyne. Representative Van Duyne, 'no'. Well.... Representative Kempiners, 'no'. Dump this Roll Call.

Dyer: "Anti-family, anti-family..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's Motion for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Catania to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As I pointed out, this Amendment was adopted earlier



JUN 30 1976

53.

on a Bill that unfortunately was Tabled. It was adopted by a vote of 89 to 33. Now, it has also been pointed out that there is another worker's compensation Bill coming up. I certainly will be happy to offer the Amendment to that Bill and I would hope that you would support it there since obviously you have chosen not to support on this one. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 37 'aye', and 83 'no', and the Lady's Motion fails. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2. Mautino. Amend Senate Bill 1749 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1749 strikes everything after the enacting clause and inserts therein the language of House Bill 3604 which we passed out of here by a large majority. What the Amendment does is makes the changes in the assigned risk pool and the procedures for getting in. It sets up a commission to grant binding authority on a 25% premium so that the employees and the employees...employers and employees are covered; make sure that they have a copy of the policy at the broker and at the place of business. And the commission shall provide for the compensation to the agent getting the business and putting it into the pool and it also allows for employers to pay their annual premiums in payments, quarterly payments, rather than on a front-end those premiums that are over and above a \$1,000. What we are doing here is making it be exactly as 3604 which passed out of here and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, this is an agreed Amendment to this Bill and as Representative Mautino has just explained it puts the Bill in the same shape as our own House Bill 3604 which was Sponsored by Representative Kane and is a Bill, which I think, will aid greatly in the placement of assigned risk policies, workmen's compensation policies in the state of Illinois and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Merlo, are you seeking recognition? Question...Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think that there's anyone in the House who has worked more diligently and more fairly than Representative Mautino. Although he has time and again advocated the posture of labor on the Commission hearings and in many of our



deliberations he has been eminently fair and I think that it's a credit that this Gentleman was able to bring together two divergent opinions and arrive at this Bill. I have no doubt that it will pass but I did want to publicly acknowledge our appreciation for the Commission for the splendid work that Representative Mautino has done."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House, that Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1749 be adopted. Those in favor say aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments. Third Reading. 1756."

Clerk Selcke: "This Bill has been read a second time. No Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Selcke: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments, Third Reading. 1802."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1802 has been read a second time. No Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. Committee announcements."

Clerk Selcke: "The Members appointed to the Second Conference Committee on Senate Bill, apparently it's 1524, are as follows: Stubblefield, Berman, Bradley, Ryan, Anderson. Meeting of the Members of the Second Conference will be held June 30th at 12 o'clock in the east House corridor. The Members appointed the Second Conference on Senate Bill 1956 are as follows: Stubblefield, Berman, Bradley, Ryan, Anderson. The meeting of the Members of the Second Conference will be held at 6:30 on June 30th at the hour of 12 o'clock in the east House corridor."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk has advised me that the Bills appearing on Supplemental Calendar #1 were in error, that the First Conference Committee Report in both instances had been rejected and a Second Conference Committee had been requested. So disregard Supplemental Calendar #1. 1847."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, Representative Schuneman."



JUN 30 1976

56.

Schuneman: "Was 1802 passed to Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "It was moved to Third Reading."

Schuneman: "Thank you."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1847 has been read a second time. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1, Berman. Amends Senate Bill 1847, page 6, by deleting lines 11 through 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman. Before we proceed on that, it's the intention of the Chair not to break for lunch but to go right through hopefully finish early this afternoon. Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill deals with the increase in compensation for the stenographers at the Industrial Commission. The increase that's proposed by this Amendment was a compromise proposal in between that...between the current rates and the proposal on the original Bill; raised it from, I think it's 80 cents a page to a dollar a page for an original and from 35 cents to 50 cents for the copy. I move the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1847."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "I'm sorry I didn't understand. I wonder if the Speaker will yield for a question...Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond; "He will."

Palmer: "Is that...what area of court reporting will this cover?"

Berman: "The reporters that cover the arbitration hearings."

Palmer: "That the Industrial Commission?"

Berman: "Yes, Sir."

Palmer: "What are they being paid now?"

Berman: "The change...the only change that this Amendment addresses itself to was that at the current...at the present time when there is a transcript written up they are paid according to the statute 80 cents a page for the original and 35 cents a page per copy. The Bill as it arrived from the Senate authorized charging the quote



JUN 30 1976

'prevailing rate' unquote, which may...which I was...by which we were left to understand could have been close to doubling the price. The Amendment strikes a compromise by a modest increase in the cost of the transcript and strike out this prevailing rate wording and puts it in at instead of 80 cents currently to a dollar and instead of 35 cents a copy to 50 cents a copy."

Palmer: "Now is this consistent with the ordinary...the regular court reporters, say in Cook County?"

Berman: "That is the rest of the Bill and that's what the rest of the Bill does regarding salary."

Palmer: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as Sponsor of the Bill I concur with the Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further? You ready for the question? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, could the Sponsor tell us the average salary of a court reporter at the Industrial Commission?"

Berman: "I would yield to Representative Hanahan on..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "13,500 a year."

Skinner: "And what will this..."

Hanahan: "This raise will give them 16,5. And they haven't had a raise in eleven years."

Skinner: "Maybe technicality..."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further..."

Hanahan: "2500 they're going to 16,000, excuse me. From 13.5 to 16."

Skinner: "Maybe technology has improved, I can't see how anyone can jump by charging 35 cents for a copy of anything, cost about five cents."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in defense of the court reporters because if you don't have



competent court reporters to take the notes in any court proceedings I can tell you very frankly you're not going to have an honest or accurate record. And therefore I certainly speak in favor of that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill...Senate Bill 1847. Those in favor indicate by saying aye; aye; opposed, no. The ayes have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2. Walsh. Amends Senate Bill 1847 page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, as result of conversations with the House Sponsor of Senate Bill 1847 and because we're introducing Amendment #6 which take care of some of his objections I move to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none Amendment 2 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3. Walsh. Amends Senate Bill 1847 page 1, lines 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1847 requires that the Industrial Commission take into consideration conditions that existed with an injured employee before the injury for which he is making a claim before the Commission. It's an entirely reasonable idea and something that is a small step toward correcting the grievous error we made one year ago when we passed the Workmen's Compensation Amendment. And I move the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1847."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman. Give the Gentleman order, please."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I raise the question of whether this Amendment is germane to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Give us the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Amendment 3,



Mr. Clerk, will give us Amendment #3 and the Bill?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Members appointed to Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1804 are as follows: Merlo, Vitek, Beaupre, Schuneman and Catania. Meeting of the Members of this Conference Committee will be held today at the hour of 1 p.m. in the east House corridor."

Speaker Redmond: "In the opinion of the parliamentarian it is germane. Any further discussion? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there has to be discussion because you know it...it...this Amendment you gotta give Representative ...the Minority, Assistant Minority Leader, the Gentleman from Cook, a lot of credit for effort because what he's trying to do is reopen the arguments that we have heard for the last few weeks on Workmen's Compensation with this Amendment on the Court Reporters Salary Act. Now this Amendment specifically, on this Amendment I tried to oppose it based on some just rational decisions. If...if a worker, if a worker happened to have a loss of a hand and wasn't even paid for it because on line 13 of this Amendment it says it's payable not even compensated and he happens while he's waiting for that claim, he could get hit in the head by a chunk of concrete we're not going to allow the Industrial Commission to compensate on... if this Amendment were into law, the Industrial Commission would not be allowed to compensate that man as a perfect person because he had a loss of a hand, not that he was ever compensated for that hand, but just that it was payable. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the concept of Workmen's Compensation was in the common law concept to give up, to give up that right, no different than if you got hit by a car and you happen to have one eye, your claim in court can't say that you weren't a person. Now we're dealing with a human being not an animal that we could afford to take off horns, or hoof, or castrate or something like that. We're talking about human beings that when they go to work should be treated as a human being and if injured compensated



accordingly. This Amendment is a bad Amendment. It opens up all sorts of avenues of throwing out the concept of common law courtesy when the Workmen's Compensation Laws were enacted in this state and that is that people were treated as a whole person not with all the little pieces to be taken out if there's an accident on the work site. I urge a negative vote on Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Representative Deavers I think wanted to be recognized."

Speaker Redmond: "He didn't have Representative Lauer push the button. Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that this is a reasonable approach to a problem and the fact that all we're asking here is the fact that if there is a pre-existing condition that the Industrial Commission be made aware of the previous history at the time that a new record or proof of loss has occurred. Let's say that I've got my old football knees that whereby that 20 years ago when I was playing football somebody tore it up and now I go to work for somebody and I pick up a heavy weight in the House of Representatives my billbook here or something and the knee goes out. But I think the Industrial Commission should be made aware that I have that previous history and I think this Amendment should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the argument of the Gentleman from McHenry is absurd to...to think that someone who did not have a hand and was hit over the head would not be compensated in the same way that someone who was hit on the head who did have a hand is just not what this Amendment says. And I call your attention to the language in the Amendment, reading from where he did at line 12, or before line 12, line 11, that they're...an employee had suffered any permanent



physical impairment prior to the accident or injury for which compensation is payable the Industrial Commission shall take such pre-existing physical impairment into consideration and shall award compensation only to the extent that such pre-existing condition has been aggravated by the injury. Now, that says very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that only the pre-existing condition and what is aggravated or how that is aggravated by the new injury is taken into consideration and not anything else. So that if a person did not have a hand and was hurt someplace else on his body then the fact that he did not have a hand would not be a factor in determining what his award shall be. This is entirely reasonable Amendment, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman is wrong and attempts to mislead in saying that what he did say in the example he used and I urge the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #3. Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? I hear noise. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, it's almost absurd to adopt this Amendment. They're talking about somebody..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh raises a question of a point of order and I think he is correct. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I think this Amendment has some merit. I'd like to recount for this House a case that I know about if I might where a worker who I'd known for a long time, who had a back injury, it was a long standing back injury. He retired from his previous work with the back in a...in a condition of his long standing problem. He went to work on a part-time basis for another employer who was unaware of his previous back injury. The first day on the job his back injury was aggravated. As a result of that the employee had an operation which he should have had many years before when he was self-employed. And as a result of that one case the employer and the employer's insurance company was forced to pay a claim which approximated



\$30,000. Now the Industrial Commission, as I understand it, pays no attention to any previous injuries that an employee might have had and I think this matter deserves some...some attention and I would tend to support the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 81 aye and 68 no. The Gentleman's motion prevails.



Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4, Catania, amends Senate Bill 1847, page 1, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "The Motion...no, I said the Motion carried. And, the Amendment is adopted. I may have said the Motion prevailed, but .... carry and prevail are very nearly synonymous. Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the Amendment that provides that the household workers will have coverage under Worker's Compensation, as of July 1, 1977....if they are employed for 40 hours a week, by one employer, for at least 13 weeks and I ask for adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question....ready for the question? The question is on the Lady's Motion to adopt Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1847. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no',....."

Catania: "Roll Call, please."

Speaker Redmond: "...Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Well, I think we should again remind ourselves, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and Mr. Speaker, that in the language of Paragraph 18, line 20, page 3 of this Amendment, you are not talking about a household employee, you are talking about the cumulative 40 hours a week of your....anyone who is mowing your lawn,.....taking care of a baby sitter that's working several hours a week, if they all add up to 40 hours or ..more a week, for a 13 week period, you're locked in at your house, in filing a set of books comparable to General Motors and driving the whole system nuts. This is an insane Amendment and I would recommend a 'no' vote on it because it involves every family in the



State of Illinois, cumulatively...not separately."

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

Catania: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would point out that what we're talking about here is 13 weeks out of the calendar year, with household employees who work 40 hours or more in a workweek, those are full-time employees. And, those people are just as entitled to dignity in their jobs, and some security if they are injured, as any other worker on any other job in the State of Illinois. Now, I was reading in 'Farm Week' last week that you can insure a cow for \$3000. Now, if you want to insure a cow for \$3000, I think that certainly the people who care for our children are entitled to some insurance on the job against injury. That's all we're asking for here.... is some basic human dignity, which is what I think we're all supposed to be here to guarantee for the people of the State of Illinois. This is a good sound Amendment to do that. To guarantee human dignity."

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

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed at the 'no' vote here today. We've already approved of this concept in another Bill. And, through no fault of the Sponsor of this Amendment, that Bill was Tabled. We took a dry run on Mr. Schuneman's Bill and it was voted down and there was some confusion as to whether or not it was germane, but obviously it's germane here. It is a good Amendment. We've already approved of it. I think we should ratify and affirm it by voting green on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House; first of all it seems to me that in the last debate on this issue it was pointed out that we had



passed the issue before and there was a sort of a suggestion that if it was not put on the previous Bill it would be put on this one. But, I happen to be a member of a board of a charitable organization called 'Homemakers Service', and this is a portion of a charitable activity that takes place throughout Cook County, Illinois. And, those persons who are employed as homemakers by this organization, are offered to all of the communities, in Cook County, where emergencies occur in households. If a father has a heart attack and the mother is an invalid and somebody has to take care of the children, this organization sends a homemaker into that home. And, they do it on the premise of ability to pay. If a person can't pay, this organization doesn't charge. However, the organization itself does pay the homemaker. Now, these are full-time persons who work for the benefit of the community and distressed families. It seems to me it's impossible to distinguish....I'll finish up, Mr. Speaker....it seems to me it's impossible to distinguish between those homemakers who are full-time, salaried, homemakers for the benefit of the distressed and any other employee that there could....in any other job. It seems to me only reasonable..."

Speaker Davis: "Will the Gentleman please conclude his remarks?"

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that we not discriminate against homemakers simply because their work is domestic."

Speaker Davis: "Recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bob Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House..."

Speaker Davis: "Just a minute....Representative Adeline Geo-Karis votes 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Now, all right, proceed."



Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on but was not recognized during the debate. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I look at those red lights on the board, I find that many of them are the same people who condemn the poor and minority groups because they're on public assistance and welfare. And yet so many of these domestic people who ride public conveyances, maybe 60 or 70 miles round trip, every day struggling and fighting to maintain an existence with dignity and pride, certainly deserve the same consideration that any other employee in the State of Illinois deserves. And, if you don't want to be hypocrites about the work ethics and hypocrites about those of whom should receive public assistance and those who should not, you'll change your light from red to green and encourage people who at great costs, both emotional and physical, are staying in there and working trying to maintain themselves and their families. I consider it absolutely hypocritical for those of you who constantly talk about what we need in this country is more of the work ethics, what we need is more people with initiative, what we need is more people who are willing to go out and work and pull themselves up by their bootstraps. I suggest to you that you pull yourselves up by your intellectual hypocritical bootstraps and give this a green light. They really should deserve the same consideration that people cleaning a building or working in a plant get and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker....Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'no' vote I would simply like to say this ..... that every day seems to be 'Resurrection Day' for this concept or one



similar to it. It continues to rise, phoenix-like, from the ashes. It appears like van Gogh's ghost. It rides through the Chambers of this House like the Headless Horseman, leaving us poor guys like..... around here like Ichabod Crane....to shiver and shake, and in my opinion, if there is anything that will introduce the long arm of the federal bureaucracy and other bureaucracies .... into our domestic affairs, it is this concept. Forms, rules, regulations, and if there is anything that will discourage people from entering into this area of domestic help, and offering their services to the poor beleaguered housewife that needs all the help that she can get, but I'll tell you she's not going to take it under these conditions, if there is anything that will discourage employment in this area, I think it's this particular concept. I would say that we're helping the housewife if we defeat this concept....and I would certainly urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think, where the expressions.....that were given on the other side of the aisle, just a few moments ago....we should oppose this concept....because for many of these people who do travel 30 or 40 miles to these various jobs, and work as domestics, they are interested in obtaining employment, employment so they can 'lift themselves up by their bootstraps'. And, we want to encourage this, we want to make sure that these people are encouraged to seek this type of employment. But, exactly what's going to happen here is, you're going to have a lot of 'employers' that are employing domestics, be faced with the bureaucracy, moving in and the additional cost to themselves, the record keeping, and the responsibility of meeting these requirements,



JUN 30 1976

67.

and they are no longer going to employ these people. Now, these people have taken the initiative to get off of the welfare rolls in many cases and to work and bring their status up in our society. And, exactly what we're going to do is create a regressive attitude for them and they are going to be forced out of employment and back on public aid rolls. And, I would support a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I couldn't disagree more with the last two speakers on the other side of the aisle. This Amendment will encourage employment rather than discourage employment. Why don't these people have the same rights to benefits? You know, if you consider this type of employment, we entrust domestic helpers with great amounts of responsibility with our homes, and often times with our families, we give them this responsibility, and yet we want to deny them certain benefits? There is a Bill sitting on the Governor's desk that would give domestics these benefits in 1980. I'd like to hear anybody get up and say ....if these benefits are okay for 1980, what's wrong with giving it to them in 1977? I'd like to hear one reason. We want to give people the initiative to get up and work? Let's pass this Amendment. Let's put some more green votes on there."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, it was once said that the truth stamped into the earth a thousand times will rise again. It is my hope that this Bill will continue to rise because it is right. What you're talking about here is a little balance between the needy and the greedy. Yes, I know it hurts to .....



do the housework when you have manicured nails. And, I know it's nice to sit up and say that everybody ought to have someone to do all the dirty, menial tasks that are unfitting for themselves. But, I suggest to you that the people that do this type of work are the backbone of society because they are doing work which we refuse to do for ourselves. I suggest to you that these people need a chance, they need an opportunity, and why is it that they should not be covered? We say for ourselves, everything is good enough. When we say for us that \$36 a day isn't even good enough to pay our expenses. Well, I say to you the domestic makes far less than that, they make anywhere from \$15 to maybe \$20 a day for hard manual labor....and 8 hours. I appeal to your sense of dignity....to your sense of fairness, that you support this type of Legislation. And, again I point out to you, stamp it into the earth if you will, but it will rise again, because it is right and true."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck, Representative Fleck...."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I oppose this Amendment and I'll tell you why. It's not necessarily the very wealthy that has these type of ....people come to work in and about their homes. It could be an average, ordinary, middle-class family that would hire some kids to come and cut the grass. Now, under the .... Workman's Compensation benefits that we passed, if some child or teenager is cutting the grass and they sever a toe or cut a toe and you aren't insured, you are going to pay 'em probably \$10,000 out of your own back pocket for that injury. If you do have insurance,..... as a homeowner, and not as a person who's in business, you're going to be screaming and yelling about the incredible insurance premiums you're paying. The



persons who are living in these homes and hiring domestics are really offering work for people where they wouldn't have it otherwise. It's not a business. It's their home and to charge Workmen's Compensation premiums on someone who owns a home or has an apartment, I think, is an absolutely ludicrous and ridiculous concept, and should overwhelmingly be rejected."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mautino. What purpose does the Gentleman...."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I's the Gentleman from Bureau...and not...Cook..."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Bureau, yes. Pardon me."

Mautino: "I have some sincere concerns about this Legislation, mainly because it's very difficult to define household and employee. For those of us in the downstate area, we do not have 'day care centers' et cetera, what we have is many working wives who, for example, hire baby-sitters for their children so they can go to work. Under the definitions...and without a definition.... in this particular Amendment, it would seem to me that those downstate women who are working would have to have coverage so that they can go to work, coverage for those people who are watching their children. School teachers, ladies working in factories, et cetera. I'm not quite sure that this Amendment couldn't be cleaned up with a definition of household. It is not only those areas of menial tasks, or tasks that .... let's say, maid, et cetera....services. It's those other things that people go to work for. I would like to have a definition of the household concept. I think that is where the major problem is. Until that is defined, I'd certainly have to remain on a 'no' vote."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've been discussing the explana-



tion of votes for the last 25 minutes on this Amendment. The votes have not changed. Either restrict the explanation to 5 seconds or let's take the Roll on this, please."

Speaker Davis: "Just a minute now, Mr.....You know I've been praying for you, now you need to pray for me. What about the middle of the Roll Call? On explanation of votes....ah...on explanation of votes, don't they have a right to....They have a right to explain their votes. Pardon me....One minute, all right. The Gentleman recognizes the distinguished Lady Representative Giddy Dyer."

Dyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to respond to a matter of fact asked by Mr. Mautino, I hope that doesn't count on my time, because this is the first time I've spoken on this Bill. To respond to Mr. Mautino, there is a definition. This coverage would apply to domestic....."

Speaker Davis: "Pardon me just a moment. For what purpose does Representative Fleck arise?.....She has one minute to explain her vote, doesn't she? All right. Thank you very much."

Dyer: "Thank you. Thank you. The definition is...applies to a worker who works 40 hours a week for 13 weeks in the home. That's very clear. Now, I'd like to give you a personal example. Our cleaning woman, whom makes it possible for me to be down here for better or worse, slipped on the ice and broke her wrist. Technically and legally we were not responsible, but here is a woman who was too young for Social Security benefits, on her medical coverage didn't cover it, just because she works in our home, one day a week, we're not going to let her go into debt for five or six hundred dollars, so her five employers chipped in together and we picked up the slack. If this had been the postman, the man who delivers our mail, just every morning, he would have



JUN 30 1976.

71.

been covered with Workman's Compensation. Now, I ask you, isn't it fair that the person in your home who is liable for that accident, have coverage?"

Speaker Davis: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos, is he there? His light is on. The Gentleman from Whiteside, his light is on. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Davis: "Did you speak?.....Pardon me."

Schuneman: "No, Sir, I didn't."

Speaker Davis: "All right, go right ahead."

Schuneman: "I hate to belabor this point but, I'd like to reiterate that Representative Fleck and Representative Mautino were absolutely right about their fears about this Amendment. I think one of the problems we have to face is that many of the people who are employed on a part-time basis, like those suggested by Representative Dyer, are in fact not employable in regular industry. And, therefore, they take part-time work. Many of these people in my own knowledge are not deducting Social Security and Withholding Taxes, and therefore, I think, if we pass this Bill, we're going to raise the specter for the homeowner who is going to have to withhold Social Security, he's going to have to withhold his Withholding Taxes, he's going to have to buy Workmen's Compensation Insurance, which he does not now have. And, his present homeowners policy is not going to cover the liability that he has under Workman's Compensation. And I really think we're raising a real problem for ourselves. If we think we've had a response from industry, just wait until we pass this Amendment and see what you get from the homeowners who hire people on a part-time basis."

Speaker Davis: "I'm going to have to insist on the one minute rule. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUN 30 1976

72.

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the basic issue involved in the question as to who will receive Workman's Compensation, is whether or not the State will bear the cost of injury to domestics or whether or not the person who hires the domestic privately will bear the cost. If a domestic does not have Workman's Compensation and is injured, all that is going to happen is that that domestic is going onto General Assistance, or Aid to Dependent Children, or public dole. And, rather than increasing the untenable situation that we have now, in reference to dole and relief, the person who hires that person privately ought to have the responsibility of having Workman's Compensation Insurance. That's the simple bottom-line proposition here...so that..that person will not have to go onto public...public aid or public dole. I think that that is a very reasonable...reasonable proposition and that there is no question but that we ought to be voting 'yes'."

Speaker Davis: "Thank you, Mrs. Younge. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Roll, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 72 'ayes', 90 'nays', one 'present', and 14 'no'.....not voting. This Amendment having failed to reach a majority is hereby declared lost."



Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #5. Catania. Amends Senate Bill 1847 page 1, by deleting lines 1, 2, and 3 and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "Lady from Cook, Representative Catania. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook for...to explain the Amendment. Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Hanahan had an objection to this Amendment earlier, it's the one that changes it from Workmen's to Worker's Compensation. I would yield to Representative Hanahan on this one."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment is a 140-some pages thick and all it does it change the word 'workmen' to 'worker'. I have no objection to the Amendment as long as we're amending the total Workmen's Compensation Act. It is ...as long as we're into that aspect of this Bill to adopt this Amendment. It's brought about on the premise that we're de-sexualizing our laws and workmen may have some sort of sexual connotation to some people who are sensitive of this issue and for those people I defer and accept Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1847."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor'd yield for a question. Last time this Amendment came up and of course it's not in the bill-book so it's...it's so large that it wasn't distributed..."

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will, Representative Hanahan, are your...Representative..."

Deuster: "Last time this Amendment was presented we were advised that there was some possibly substantial or substantive language in it that presented a problem. Is that language still here and if so what is it and what does it say so that those of us who don't have the Amendment will have an opportunity to know what we're considering."

Hanahan: "Yes, that language is not in this Amendment that...where we had a question.....added language and it is...it is a cure bill that strictly changes worker...workmen to worker throughout



the statute."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Cook...are you...have you finished, Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters. Proceed."

Peters: "Will Representative Hanahan yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Peters: "Representative Hanahan, do you have any idea how much this gesture will cost in changing a 140-some odd pages in our statutes?"

Hanahan: "It will cost nothing because the statute has to be re-written because of the Senate Bill 1967."

Peters: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, why don't we change this to workperson and that'll really have it fouled up."

Hanahan: "Offer the Amendment."

Speaker Davis: "The question is shall Amendment #5 pass? All in favor will say aye. Opposed, nay. All in favor will vote aye and opposed nay. Explanation of votes, the Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention to those people who are voting no that this is a change which is taking place in all the states of the United States now. Workmen's Compensation Laws are becoming known as Worker's Compensation Laws and I really think it's foolish to resist this change, it's coming anyway."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skinner...Gentleman from McHenry. The Chair recognizes..."

Skinner: "I...no comment is needed at this point."

Speaker Davis: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 86 yeas, 36 nays, 1 voting present and 54 absent and the Amendment is hereby declared adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #6. Walsh. Amends Senate Bill 1847 page 1, line 1 and so forth."



Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, the...Assistant Minority Leader. Thank you, Sir."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an Amendment the thrust of which the Sponsor of the Bill agrees with..."

Speaker Davis: "Just a minute. What purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry arise?"

Hanahan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Davis: "State your..."

Hanahan: "Now that Amendment #5 is attached to the Bill, is Amendment #6 in proper form?"

Speaker Davis: "Let's...let's look and see. I'll call on my expert. The Parliamentarian informs me that Amendment #6 is inconsistent with Amendment #5. Amendment #5, as you say, has been adopted and this Amendment is inconsistent. Gentleman from Cook, the Minority Leader, Assistant Minority Leader."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Parliamentarian in...in what detail the Amendment is inconsistent? There's no point in the Amendment #6 that I can see on a quick reading where it refers Workmen's Compensation in the changes we've made, Mr. Parliamentarian. Is there?"

Speaker Davis: "Number one, it improperly amends the title of the Bill. It improperly, Sir, amends the title of the Bill."

Walsh: "Now...now, Mr. Speaker, that...that seems to be an Amendment or a difficulty that is not very serious if we're talking about the title and I wonder if we could, Mr. Speaker, amend this Amendment on its face? I wonder if the..."

Speaker Davis: "The Parliamentarian tells me that you'd have to rewrite the whole thing. If you have leave you can do it."

Walsh: "I would request leave."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman requests leave to rewrite the Amendment. Any objections? Representative Hanahan objects."

Hanahan: "...Speaker, I had a simple one letter, one word change, and was not granted leave by some less than, what I consider nice Gentlemen on the floor of this House, and now I'm going to be



...asked to amend a whole Bill all over the place? I object."

Speaker Davis: "Now. Now just a minute. The Amendment is out of order and he objects so you would have to file a new one."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what. To show I am a Gentleman I'll hold the Bill on Second Reading until he gets the proper Amendment; leave the Bill on Second Reading. Take it out of the record."

Speaker Davis: "Is that all right with you, you'll file a..."

Walsh: "Yes, if I may respond. And I appreciate that very much, Mr. Hanahan, but I hate to point out that I certainly did not object to the change that you referred to and I...I'm sure that the person who did object probably would have extended you the same courtesy that you are extending me and I appreciate it."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff, is that who...what purpose do you arise? Just a minute, pardon me. For the purpose of an announcement, Representative Washburn."

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

Speaker Davis: "...Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have the wife and son of one of our most respected and distinguished Members with us in the Speaker's gallery this morning, Mrs. Ralph Dunn, Ellen Dunn, and son, Jerry Dunn. If you please, be recognized."

Speaker Davis: "What purpose does the Gentleman, Mr. Ebbesen, from DeKalb arise?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, since this particular Amendment we're referring to here that just changes one letter and no one has a copy, is that...in that...is the letter in the word worker, is it an 'e' or an 'o' that's being used here because I'd hate to have the letter 'o' used and then be called a workor's compensation law."

Speaker Davis: "I hope we can appreciate it's out of the record. Representative Deuster, you wish to be recognized?"

Deuster: "Well, I did on the Bill that the Sponsor was anxious to have the matter considered..."

Speaker Davis: "It's out of the record...you mean this..."

Deuster: "He...he wants it out of the record, okay. Thank you, Mr.



Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Senate Bill 1853, Mr. Clerk, that one's out of the record we'll come back to it when..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1853. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. LaFleur. Amends Senate Bill 1853 on page 1 by deleting lines 9 through 15 and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "Just a minute. Just a minute. Indulge the Speaker. In...in presenting to this House a very distinguished lady who ...she and her husband have been my close friends, friends of my family for many years, I'd like to have Mrs. Paul Randolph stand. Amendment #1, Representative LaFleur. Yes, just a minute, what purpose does Representative Maragos arise?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like for you and the Parliamentarian to look over the Amendment because I think it's technically deficient because the...what it tries to do is not...it's got the wrong lettering and wrong numbering on the line."

Speaker Davis: "Just a minute, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question on that."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from...proceed."

LaFleur: "I had asked for a fiscal note, has that been filed? No."

Speaker Davis: "Is the fiscal note filed, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Clerk, is the fiscal note there? Will the Clerk make the announcement on the fiscal note. What purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative LaFleur, arise?"

LaFleur: "Has the fiscal note been filed?"

Speaker Davis: "Well, this is what we're trying..."

Clerk O'Brien: "There is...there is...request for a fiscal note filed, no fiscal note has been submitted yet."

LaFleur: "Perhaps we could take these out of the record until something..."

Speaker Davis: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Let's go back to 1853, Mr. Clerk. Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 1853. It's improper if you'll take a look at it because it refers to the wrong page. It could be amended on its face, Sir. Gentleman..."



LaFleur: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, yes, what I'm trying to inquire here and we will ask for that if that's the order of business you wish to go on. If the fiscal note has not been filed then we can take care of this matter. Now, whatever you desire."

Speaker Davis: "We'll take it out of the record, is that all right. You...take it out of the record. Senate Bill #1854."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1854. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Yes, I..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, LaFleur, amends Senate Bill 1854 on page 1 by deleting line 12 and inserting in lieu thereof 'employees are' to there."

LaFleur: "A request for a fiscal note has been filed on House Bill 1854 also. Has that been filed?"

Speaker Davis: "Has that been filed? A request for fiscal note on 1854? Does the Sponsor wish to proceed to the Amendment? Do you object, Representative Maragos? What purpose do you rise?"

Maragos: "What...what is the procedure? What about 1854, what's he doing? Putting another Amendment on it?"

Speaker Davis: "A fiscal note was..."

Maragos: "There is no fiscal consequences for the State of Illinois."

Speaker Davis: "What's your objection? We can...we can proceed to Amendment #1 then on...on 18...Amendment #1, Representative LaFleur, please."

LaFleur: "The fiscal note, what is your ruling on the fiscal note, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Davis: "Let's take the Amendment first and then we'll take the fiscal note afterwards. Would you..."

LaFleur: "I would prefer to disagree with the Chair but I would...I would like to see the filing of the fiscal note before we handle the Bill."

Maragos: "It's not required..."

Speaker Davis: "The...I'm advised that you cannot file note until the Amendment's adopted. That right? If the Amendment affects the



physical consequences of the Bill it will affect the fiscal note. Do you agree?"

LaFleur: "No, I...I respectfully disagree, Mr. Speaker, I believe the requirements of a fiscal note is that it...that it, a fiscal note be filed and I do not think that there can be an advancement or a hearing on the Bill until that fiscal note is filed."

Speaker Davis: "Well, we...we're talking to the fact that we cannot move it to Third Reading, Third Reading, if a fiscal note is required. But we can proceed, can't we, with...with the Amendment?"

LaFleur: "Well...at the time of the fiscal note filing then we could handle the Amendment also. I think..."

Speaker Davis: "What do you wish?"

LaFleur: "I wish to take it out of the record..."

Maragos: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker, just a minute..."

Speaker Davis: "What does the Sponsor of the Bill wish to take it out of the record?"

Maragos: "No, just a minute. Mr. Speaker, 1854..."

Speaker Davis: "What purpose do you arise?"

Maragos: "1854, the context of that has nothing to do with state revenue, it does not require a fiscal note. 1853 is correct, it does and there will be a fiscal note shortly. But 1854 does not require... will you please look at the context of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Just a minute, Mr. Maragos. Mr...Representative Marago's point is well taken, this does not affect state revenue; only local revenue and therefore fiscal note is not required. Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to dissent from that, I think it's based on bad information. If you look you will see that it will definitely affect the formula for the distribution for state aid to schools and I don't know how that doesn't affect the...the revenue of the state."

Speaker Davis: "That still doesn't affect state revenue does it?"

LaFleur: "Well, where are they getting money? I can't buy the fact that it comes from government and the taxpayers don't pay it."

Speaker Davis: "It does not affect state taxation. The Gentleman



from Cook, Representative Lundy, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Fiscal Note Act makes very clear that if a fiscal note is required and a ruling is made that it's not...if a fiscal note is requested and a ruling is made that it's not required then the...the person who is asking for the note has one recourse and that is to move that a fiscal note be furnished. And if 89 Members agree with that Member then a fiscal note will be required. I suggest to Representative LaFleur that that is his remedy in the situation."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman so move? The Gentleman moves that a fiscal note be required to...on Senate Bill 1854. All in favor will let it be known by saying aye; opposed, nay. The nays seem to have it. Gentleman demands a Roll Call. All in favor will vote aye and the opposed will vote nay. Take...Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, what purpose you arise? All voted who wish? All voted who wish? On this question there are 43 yeas, and 86 nays, 1 voting present. The Gentleman's motion fails. We're back now to Amendment #1. Representative LaFleur, pardon me for not...we're back to Amendment #1. Proceed, Sir."

Pierce: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 1854 is that special interest group coming back here again to pass a Bill that would allow trust companies to get around the personal property tax. Well, this...this is well and good and I don't think that it's a...worst thing but unfortunately it's in Cook County. In Cook County is the only place that's making an application of the personal property tax. Now the personal property tax was taken off of trust companies by the passage of the Day Bill. And the Day Bill added Section 1921-B to the Revenue Act, should already exempt these RIA accounts. Now I don't what the...what the game is in...in Chicago because they want to trust...the RI...IRA accounts of trust companies in Chicago but they shouldn't even be levying a personal property tax on these at this time. Now I don't know why they come down for this special purpose Bill that would be a small group that wouldn't affect the people. I



would like to move that Amendment #1 to House...Senate Bill 1854 be adopted."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman moves to adopt Amendment #1 on...just a minute...what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos, arise?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Sponsor of the Bill should have some say...object to the Amendment because what his Amendment..."

Speaker Davis: "Proceed. Proceed."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment, what it does, is really takes the...destroys the Bill. The point is...the point is that these IRA accounts should be in the same posture as any other pension plan and if we adopt that Amendment we destroy the Bill of 1854. And I ask that we...give it a no vote."

Speaker Davis: "Any further discussion? Any...oh...the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, I have a question for the Sponsor of the Amendment."

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

Leinenweber: "Representative LaFleur, as I read the Bill this applies to intangible and personal property tax on trust or funds created and maintained for the purpose of pensions. That's already in the law for plans created by employers for employees, is that correct?"

LaFleur: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Well, what's wrong with extending that to the pension plan created, let's say a doctor or a lawyer or any self-employed person?"

LaFleur: "What happens to them?"

Leinenweber: "No, what's wrong...what's the objection to extending what's already in the law to the self-employed person in his pension plan?"

LaFleur: "Well, that's what this Amendment does, it extends it to everybody, it makes it equal for everybody."

Leinenweber: "No, as I read it you are striking out everything in the... that's added to the Bill..."

LaFleur: "That is right."



Leinenweber: "And so you leave only...the only exemption then is for a pension fund established by employers for employees. Now, my question is, what's wrong with extending the same rights to the employees of employers to extend those rights that that group of people have to those who are self-employed?"

LaFleur: "Well, the problem here, Harry, is the...is the fact that Cook County is levying an illegal personal property tax and we're coming down for legislation to alleviate themselves of this on the trust company. Now if this is the intention of the Legislature to act this way so we've already faced this problem under the Day Bill. Now if they would follow the law at this time and not levy personal property tax on these trusts we wouldn't have this problem."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly on the Amendment, I... I don't see where the Gentleman's fears are justified at all. It seems to me that we have in the law right now an exemption for intangible personal property belonging to trust or pension funds created by employers for their employees. Now there's a large class of people under Internal Revenue Service Laws are permitted and encouraged to establish pension plans for themselves. These are the class of self-employed people who don't work for somebody else and I can't in the world see why if we're willing to go to give this exemption to employees of employer created trusts why we can't extend the same exemptions to the person who happens ....who unfortunately or fortunately, as the case may be, does not have an employer."

Speaker Davis: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, what the Representative from Will County just said is absolutely right. And this also extends to those employees whose employers do not set up a pension trust for them. There are many employees of various companies throughout the state who have no plan set up for them at all. And under the provisions of the federal code they have the opportunity just as does the self-employed person to make



arrangements for their...their own pension situation, for their own retirement and they should have the same opportunity to be exempt as those persons who...who have an...a pension trust set up for them by their employers. This is just extending equity to all those persons who do not have employers or who do not have a situation where they have a pension that is made available for them and who are trying to do it for themselves. I think that all people in the state in...in similar situations should be treated exactly the same and that's all that this provision that is suggested in 1854 would do.. And I strongly urge that this Amendment would be defeated."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian, did you wish to be...light on? Oh, his light's off, that's all right. The question is shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor will let it...known by saying aye; the opposed nay. The no's seem to have it and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos, you wish to be recognized?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, shall we go back to 1853? By the time we have the Amendments...we have to discuss the Amendment first and then go on to the request of the fiscal note."

Speaker Davis: "1854 goes to Third Reading you know."

Maragos: "Yes."

Speaker Davis: "All right. Now, do you want to go back to 1853, is that it?"

Maragos: "If I may, Mr.. Speaker."

Speaker Davis: "Mr. Clerk, will you pick up 18..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1853, this Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1. LaFleur. Amends Senate Bill 1853 on page 1 by deleting line 9 through 15 and so forth."

Speaker Davis: "...Gentleman from Cook..."

Maragos: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, again I raise the same technical objection to Amendment #1 because it's not in



proper form at the present time, as was ruled by the Chair."

Speaker Davis: "Representative LaFleur, did you have a...you're the Sponsor."

LaFleur: "I must object to going back to this, you took it out of the record for the purpose of that. My staff man went up to the Parliamentarian to get to the objection and he has taken my complete file on this Bill to correct that Amendment. We'll be back ready in the half hour or so so I don't know under what Rule you go back. I thought we were to follow the order of the calendar."

Speaker Davis: "Give him some time will you please?"

Maragos: "All right, I'll hold it."

Speaker Davis: "All right, he'll hold it. Take it out of the record."

LaFleur: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "...Was Senate Bill 1949 on the calendar. Who's handling this?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1949. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1952."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1952. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Any Amendments from the floor? Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, in reference to Senate Bill '1932' I ask leave of the House to recommit this Bill to Judiciary I and there refer to the Interim Study Committee."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman asks permission to recommit the Bill to Judiciary I. Any objections? Oh, Representative Tipword, the Gentleman from..."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, before the Bill is recommitted could I have permission, there are some Amendments that are listed in my name and I wonder if I could have permission to table those Amendments? Let the Bill go back..."



- Speaker Davis: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table those Amendments?  
All right. Table the Amendments, Mr. Clerk. And the Bill will be recommitted. With leave of the House the Bill is now recommitted to...placed on the Interim Study Calendar. Senate Bill 2015."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2015. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Davis: "Any Amendments from the floor? Any Amendments from the floor? If not...hold it."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1. Brummet. Amends Senate Bill 2015 on page 1, line 2 by deleting 'Illinois' and so forth."
- Speaker Davis: "The Chair recognizes Representative Brummet from Fayette County."
- Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of this... all this Amendment is is another easement from the Department of Transportation for Pike County; you have the Amendment on your desk if you'd care to look it over. It has been approved by the Department of Transportation and it fits in with the Bill itself. And I would ask for an okay on this one Amendment."
- Speaker Davis: "Any discussion? Oh, Representative Schlickman, pardon me."
- Schlickman: "Parliamentary inquiry? Aren't you going to leave to Dave?"
- Speaker Davis: "Did you have a question?"
- Schlickman: "I question the germaneness of this Amendment."
- Speaker Davis: "Let's...let's take a look at it, Mr. Clerk."
- Brummet: "Well, this Amendment is exactly the same as the Bill. Each one of these, the Bill and the Amendment itself, has to do with the Department of Transportation on an easement or right-of-way. One of them happens to be in Pike County and the other one happens to be in Madison County."
- Speaker Davis: "It's an ease...on an easement I've been informed and the Amendment is germane. I hope this..."
- Schlickman: "I expected that."
- Speaker Davis: "...I hope you agree with me. Any further discussion on Amendment #1 to 2015? If not, the question is, shall Amendment #1 to 2015 be adopted. All in favor will let it be known by saying aye; opposed nay. Ayes have it; Amendment's adopted."



Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Davis: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. We'll go to Senate Bills on Third Reading now. On the calendar is Senate Bill 1523, an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Senate Bill 1523."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1523. A Bill for an act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stubblefield, Chair recognizes...you're handling this aren't you? You're handling this Bill, aren't you?"

Stubblefield: "Let's go ahead, Mr. Speaker, can you take it out for just a minute, I can't find the material."

Speaker Davis: "Can we...all right, we'll take it out. We'll go to the next one. Senate Bill 1678, Representative Maragos. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1739 is on the record. Read the Bill. Oh."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1739. A Bill for an act in relation to the implementation of a public library self insurance plan on the behalf of the State Department of Finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill deals with the provision allowing the Department of Finance, Division of Risk Management, to institute a program of self-insurance for public liability insurance coverage. The Department has presented facts to the Insurance Committee of this House and the Senate indicating that there's been a substantial increase and that we are on the verge of perhaps another substantial increase in the quotes for public liability insurance coverage for the automobiles that the state operates. We have submitted a number of amendments to Senate Bill 1739 and the posture in which it is as it's presented to us for final passage, as amended, allows the Department the option, and I underline the word the option, of going to a self-insurance program. The option of course will be determined upon the economics involved based upon bids that will be submitted



by commercial companies and the evaluation of a self-insurance program. The Amendment directed itself to the questions that are involved in claims that are filed: (a) against the state and (b) against the drivers themselves who operate state-owned automobiles. We have addressed ourselves to these problems by providing for, again, the option of self-insurance for automobile and other types of general liability coverage. We have provided for a million dollar coverage both under self-insurance and also to amend the Court of Claims Act as to liability for those types of suits. We have provided and mandated that if there...if a driver of a state-owned car who is within the course of his employment is involved in an accident and the plaintiff sues him in the circuit court or the federal court or some other forum that the state must defend and hold him harmless just as if it was commercial insurance. And lastly, that the state still was within the jurisdiction that they are sued solely, they are within the jurisdiction of the court of claims. I'd be glad to respond to any questions and solicit an affirmative vote."

Speaker Davis: "Any discussion on 1739? The question is then, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will vote aye; opposed nay. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 135 ayes; no no's; and 1 present. Senate Bill 1439 having received the constitutional majority...1739 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Stubblefield, are you ready? Senate Bill 1523, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1523. A Bill for an act to amend sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Davis: "Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that extends the freeze of 1974 equalized assessed value through 1977. This would be an extension of



one year of that freeze which would enable counties that were above the 40% assessed valuation, at the time 990 was passed to get down to the 33-1/3% without the loss of actual cash dollars. In passing 990, we provided a transition period of three years for the counties that were below to come up to the 33-1/3 level but only two years for those above to get down to that level. And we have found, I think belatedly, that we put an undue burden upon the taxing bodies in...in counties that were above 40%. And this would affect all of the counties that were above 33-1/3%. It will help all the taxing bodies, school districts, park districts, county and township governments. It doesn't cost the state anything. It passed out of the Senate without a dissenting vote and I would urge a favorable vote. As far as I know it is not a controversial measure."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman.

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Berman: "Guy, if 1524 passes out, becomes law, how does this Bill interplay with that one?"

Stubblefield: "Representative Berman, this is really a part or...of a package; 1524 is a Bill that would require the expenditure of state funds to alleviate some problems in the school districts. This is a Bill which would allow some self-help, not by raising taxes for anyone but by extending the freeze it would maintain a level of payment for one additional year that would prevent in counties particularly those that were close to the...that were a long way from the 33-1/3 to finance their own budget. Some of those plans were made for a longer period than the two-year freeze will take care of and the additional year will simply be a self-help provision."

Berman: "Well, isn't...is it true that this Bill is...that either of these Bills are alternative approaches; one self-help and



JUN 30 1976

the other state help. Do you really need both?"

Stubblefield: "Yes. I believe that the losses to the counties with both measurers would not fully replace the losses. It would take both and it is unreasonable to come back to the state and ask for full support. We felt that the local citizenship ought to pick up part of the burden and this Bill would do that."

Berman: "Just one more question. Does this apply only to Winnebago County or does it apply..."

Stubblefield: "No, Sir, it applies to all counties that are over 33-1/3%."

Berman: "Thank you."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Cook, Minority Leader, Assistant Minority Leader, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the thing that occurred to me in connection with this Bill is that it is going for 12 or 13 counties what we in the suburban Cook County area and in the collar counties and throughout much of the rest of the state are trying to do by Amendment to 1524, that's Representative Porter's Amendment, and that is permit our school districts to tax at a level where they feel they can provide adequate educational services. Now I don't see why we should, Mr. Speaker, permit Winnebago and 11 or 12 other small counties to do this when they together with Chicago won't permit us to have the rollback. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that maybe we ought to beat this Bill for the time being and maybe negotiate a little bit."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know an hour or so ago I got up and spoke in behalf of the grant to Winnebago County. I did indeed tell you that when we passed 990 that we knew there would be a problem in regard to Winnebago County. But this General Assembly at that time chose to make a trade-off and what we traded was, we said in order to achieve tax equity throughout the state we're going to have to pass this measure which would create somewhat of a



JUN 30 1976

90.

problem in Winnebago County. And in return for that, in return for achieving tax equity in assessments throughout the state, we recommended at that time that there be a grant to Winnebago County. If we pass this Bill, however, if we pass this Bill we will be setting back that effort that we made last year to bring about tax equity. We're in effect forestalling it for a number of years and if we continue to forestall it every year, every year, we'll end up in a situation like we're in with the community colleges where we won't achieve what we started out to do and that is to get everyone in a community college district. This Bill will forestall achieving equitable property taxation in this state and if we start this precedent of letting people off the hook this year and we continue to do it, and we continue to do it, we're going to continue to mis-distribute state aid in this state and huge amounts of dollars as we have in the last few years. And I urge its defeat."

Speaker Davis: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the passage of this Bill. I would disagree with my distinguished colleague, the Assistant Minority Leader. The counties that this would help would be Adams, Bureau, Champaign, Pope, Iroquois, Lee, McDonough, McLean, Macon, Monroe, Peoria, Piatt, Saline, Stephenson, Tazewell, Vermilion, Wabash, Warren, Whiteside and Winnebago. So this is just not a Bill for Winnebago, it's a Bill that assist all these counties that were assessing above. So last year we allowed those counties that were below this level three years to come up to the 33-1/3% and it only seems in all fairness to allow those counties that were above to have that same time period in order to bring themselves down to the 33-1/3%. So I think this legislation is very beneficial to many counties and it's a county...a Bill that's beneficial only to Winnebago. It's a Bill that is beneficial to many, many other counties and I would urge a favorable yes vote for its passage."



JUN 30 1976

Speaker Davis: "Representative Skinner, the Gentleman from McHenry."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Does this do anymore than say that the assessment base may be no lower than it was the year before with the exception of the addition of new construction?"

Stubblefield: "All that...all this Bill does is extend the provisions that is in 990 for that transition period for one additional year. I wasn't on the Subcommittee of the Revenue which came up with the compromise that provided the transition period of three years for those below 33-1/3 only two years for those above. It finally wound up being part of the Bill and I think that mistakenly we thought that through the inflation of property that we would attain that level without the loss of money. And looking back that...I think in more than one county appears not to be true and since the legislation but it does not do anything differently than what you figured Representative."

Skinner: "Well, the answer to my question is yes or no, then?"

Stubblefield: "Ask it again so I make sure I'm answering in the right phraseology."

Skinner: "All right. House Bill 990 for counties assessed above 33% said that for the years named that the assessment base would be no lower than the...than it was the year before with the exception that new construction, the assessment on that new construction could be added to the assessment base. Is that what this Bill does except for one more year?"

Stubblefield: "That is correct."

Skinner: "Well, if I might address the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that Representative..."

Speaker Davis: "Proceed, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would suggest that the list of names that Representative Simms read off, the names of counties is grossly exaggerated. That a great number of counties will be down to 33% that now are crying wolf, Winnebago County however is probably not one



JUN 30 1976

92.

of them. Winnebago County was assessed in 1974 at 41.17% of fair market value. That was a single year accounting weighted average ratio. I don't know what it is this year but it's obviously going to be under 40% and certainly another year will take it down to 33% concerning that the average new home now is supposed to cost about \$100,000. I hope that those people from counties other than Winnebago don't think they're going to get a windfall with this Bill if the Bill actually does what the Sponsor says it does. Anybody that's assessed under 33-1/3% has no reason to vote for this Bill, or against it."

Speaker Davis: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Davis: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "Does this Bill put anymore money into the...into the distributive formula that's going out to our schools?"

Stubblefield: "This Bill does not do anything to the...as far as state revenue is concerned. It simply allows the...well, counties, to maintain the level assessment that they now have for one additional year. And it does nothing to the distributive formula."

Deuster: "Well, the question is, are you...you indicated that this puts no more money into the distributive formula. Now does this affect the way in which the existing money is distributed?"

Stubblefield: "Inasmuch as it would maintain the level of assessment and the freeze I believe that that would probably be a part of the formula and would affect in a decreasing amount the number of state aid dollars that would come to those counties."

Deuster: "I guess the answer is yes, you said probably would. I thought it was indicated earlier that this would help the schools in some counties. Is that correct?"

Stubblefield: "It would not only help the schools in the county but help other taxing bodies and only schools benefit from the state aid formula. This Bill would speak to some of the problems that we created for park districts and county governments and township governments. It would have some effect on additional dollars for school districts but not a large amount. There



JUN 30 1978

would..."

Deuster: "How many counties are helped by this Bill?"

Stubblefield: "All counties that were assessing in addition to...to  
or over 33-1/3 for the year of 1974, Representative Simms..."

Deuster: "How many counties were those?"

Stubblefield: "I believe that that was about 20 counties."

Deuster: "So...we have 102 counties. Mr. Speaker, if I might address  
the Bill. As I understand it we are not putting anymore money  
into the distribution fund to go out to our schools by this  
Bill. What we will do is work, in effect, on the way in which  
money is distributed so that 20 counties, the schools in 20  
counties will probably get more money and that means the schools  
in 82 counties will necessarily get less money. And I think  
if there was to be more money distributed, it's one thing to  
help to some people but when you're going to take from the  
schools in 82 areas and give it to the schools in 20 areas I  
think this is inequitable, unjust and the wrong time. Maybe  
we ought to do this next year or sometime when there's a whale  
of a lot of money to be thrown around. And I urge a no vote  
on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Ready for the question?  
Representative Stubblefield to close."

Stubblefield: "Well, again, I would like to urge a yes vote on this  
Bill. All it does is provide for counties that are now assessing  
above 33-1/3% to maintain their level assessment. It has no  
affect on the assessment practices of those that are below  
33-1/3. Now the Representatives in this House when we were  
debating 990 we certain that they wanted a three year tran-  
sition period for those that were below so that the taxpayer  
would not be adversely affected. I think it's only fair that  
you provide for those of us, we were assessing above 33-1/3%  
to have that same length of time to get down to 33-1/3 so that  
our taxing bodies are not adversely affected. Now to answer  
a point Representative...by Representative Deuster, he's just  
on the wrong end of the trail. By the...those of us who are



above 33-1/3% maintaining that level for one additional year, we will get less from the distributive formula which will provide more for those districts that are below and if that was his reason for voting no, then I would hope the Gentleman would be realistic and vote yes."

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

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would certainly hope these two Bills would receive adequate votes to become law. Here's the one district that got hurt under 990 worse than any district in the state. Now 990 flew out of this House by overwhelming majority changing the assessment levels throughout the state of Illinois. Everybody knew full well how bad Winnebago County and particularly their schools would be hurt. At the time that Bill went out of here I heard moral commitments, commitments from everybody that they would help alleviate the problem in Winnebago County. And what do I hear now? Counties that have underassessed for years want to get back in and do something to help themselves; no fairness, no equity, take care of me and forget about the kids up in Winnebago County. I think these two Bills should pass and should pass by overwhelming majorities in this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill would certainly affect my area as we were one of the areas that were assessed nearly the 50% as Winnebago County was. I am sympathetic to Winnebago County units of school districts and other units of government as well as my own but that Bill 990 passed out of this House a 128 practically to nothing. And let me say, this isn't ...helped the units of school districts, this is to help the taxpayers. Now you're talking about doing something for the taxpayers then if you vote for this Bill you're doing just contrary. Now 990 gave them three years to apply to get down to the...the original 33-1/3. What we're doing is trying to extend



JUN 30 1976

95.

it again. You're digging down into the taxpayers pocket and say, well, that doesn't count we want your money and we want it for another year. This is a bad concept. There are other means in this legislative process through other Bills to do this deed for the units of government. This is not going to help the taxpayers under any condition and we should defeat this."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Beaupre, do you seek recognition?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Majority Leader's speech I agree with entirely. I think he posed the case very well for aiding Winnebago County. The problem is that this is the wrong Bill to do it in. It's the other Bill that we have discussed that it should be done in by virtue of an outright grant. This doesn't just apply to Winnebago County. It will delay affecting the formula under 990 for those counties over 33-1/3% for an additional year. There is no reason to forestall that. What we need to do is deal with the problem county in affecting equitable assessments, that is to say Winnebago by giving them the grant that Representative Stubblefield is asking for in 1524. This is an alternate approach which is a bad approach because it forestalls tax justice in this state for an additional year."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 aye, 47 no. Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "May we poll the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees. Absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes..."

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

Barnes: "Yes, Sir, would you please record me as aye, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as aye. Representative Skinner, aye. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes, Campbell, Capuzi, Carroll, Craig, Darrow,



JUN 30 1976

96.

Duff, Ralph Dunn, Ewell, Ewing, Fleck, Hudson, Huff, Emil Jones, Klosak, LaFleur, Leverenz, Mahar, McPartlin, Patrick, Pierce..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Patrick, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pierce, Pouncey,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pouncey."

Pouncey: "Will you please record me as aye, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Randolph, Rose, Sharp, Taylor,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Washington, Winchester, and Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Postponed consideration, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has requested postponed consideration.

On the matter of postponed consideration. House Bill 1891, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to permit Senate Bill 1891 back to Second Reading for purpose of amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, 1891 will be returned to the order of Second Reading. Got the Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 1891 ...Amendment #1 amends Senate Bill 1891 on page 3 by inserting between line 20 and 21 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the purpose of this Amendment is to make it uniform with the other Bills regarding Park District of Chicago and it has both the Minority side and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Schlickman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Does this Bill deal only with the geographic scope?"

Maragos: "No, this is a...a Bill represented by...Mr. Merritt, it has nothing to do with the change of the Park District Act as it is, only gives it the power of condemnation for a small



JUN 30 1978

97.

area, that's all it does. Now I put this Amendment on to make sure that the public trust that is given to these particular port districts shall not be violated by...they'll have an opportunity to know one company can usurp all of the lands. This is an amendment that has been put on 3036 as it left...in the Senate after it left the House which we concurred in and also Amendment ...1789, this is the Amendment that was put on at that time which you had concurred in, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, isn't this Bill as amended by the Senate now amended by us duplicative of what we previously voted on?"

Maragos: "It approaches the problem from a different aspect. It is much more limited than what we did in 1789. This doesn't change the present makeup of the district, all it does is give it additional condemnation powers. But you can discuss the merits of the Bill later, all I'm asking for is an Amendment to put this language on which...to make it uniform with the other languages on the other two Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #1. All in favor say aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it; Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2007. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2007. A Bill for an act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill as well as the two following Bills were discussed in great...at great length last evening and I appreciated everyone's consideration then so I will be brief today. What these Bills do, 2007 provides for spreading out the funding level for pupil transportation of \$42,000,000 into four quarterly payments. By the Amendment adopted last evening, offered by Representative Polk, the state will provide \$945,000 in interest to the school districts for retaining the money and helping the state's cash flow. I urge



JUN 30 1978

your support of 2007."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, did the Sponsor ask leave to hear these all together?"

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't think he did. Do you ask leave, Representative Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objections? Hearing none 2007, 08 and 09 ...read the other Bills, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2008. A Bill for an act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2009. A Bill for an act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. I discussed it with the Secretary of State Michael Howlett, he tells me he's for this legislation. I explained to him that what it does instead of the state borrowing the money it forces school districts to do the borrowing and it flows down and will keep us fiscally sound. So I rise in support of them and would hope they'd receive the majority of the vote in the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "Last night Representative Berman asked you as far as the breakdown between the money in Chicago, suburban and the rest of the school districts. Do we have that information available today? It wasn't part of the fiscal note."

Hoffman: "Yes. Yes, I do. The special ed transportation for Chicago, let's see the total interest is 650; Chicago will receive \$260,000 of that money or 40% of it. Special ed personnel reimbursement, their share is 2.5 at...they get 30% of that, it's \$762,873 interest. Approximate total amount of interest going to Chicago is a million, well, it's a little over a million."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Representative Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you. I'll go back and get a copy, thank you."



JUN 30 1976

99.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs, or Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman...Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, someone once said, and I forget exactly who it was, 'but what a difference a day makes'.

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. Question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "One of our state officers has been quoted today as saying that the Legislators really didn't understand what was going on and he's the only one that understood state finance. Well, I understand it well enough to know that what we're doing is putting off 'til tomorrow what we should be paying today at the expense of the state. So I'm not going to support these Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege..."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder if you might hold that until I declare the results?"

Duff: "Sure."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On these questions 153 aye and 6 no and these Bills having received the constitutional majority are hereby declared passed. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I received a very pleasing letter today from one of our state officer's assistant and I want to compliment them publicly for it. Probably most of you don't know about a week ago I was rushing from committee room on the first floor to a committee on the state office building and...and turned quickly, found that the glass was so beautifully cleaned in those windows that I couldn't see it and I knocked myself a little sillier than I usually am, in fact so badly that I was almost incapacitated several days and I wrote a letter to the Secretary of State in which I made a comment that it was impressive how clean those windows had been kept but couldn't



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUN 30 1976

100.

we please put a decal at eye level as is done in so many places and literally it only took them two days. I got this letter back from Norb Johnson this morning from the Secretary of State's Office and he said before the sun sets there will be stickers on those windows. As we walked in this morning I was happy to see on the north door that they are there. Now that's real fast service, Mr. Speaker, and I think the Secretary of State and Norb Johnson are to be truly complimented for such quick response. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman's remarks will be journalized. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlemen in their wisdom knew that they'd have to move rapidly or else Representative Duff might kill himself."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania is recognized. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, I think it would have been less expensive to buy the Gentleman a football helmet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania, do you seek recognition?"

Catania: "He didn't say what the decal's going to say. It's probably going to say courtesy of the Secretary of State who's running for governor, Michael Howlett."

Speaker Redmond: "Jolly good idea. On the order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1853, Representative Maragos recognized if he can be seen."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1853. This Bill has been a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Amends Senate Bill 1853 on page 2 by deleting line 5 through 15 and so forth."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos if he can be seen."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to state for the record that Amendment #1 was ruled out of order because of imperfection. Now I see Mr. LaFleur has filed...filed Amend-



#2. I cannot tell if it's in proper order..."

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

Madigan: "What is the order of business, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills Second Reading."

Madigan: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "As I said, I ...I let the Sponsor of the Amendment speak and then I want to object to it on the merit."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1853 is a Bill that addresses itself to the Internal Revenue Section 408 which allows the individual to set up retirement accounts. This would amend the Illinois Income Tax Act which would allow a person who sets up an individual retirement account to not pay the income tax on the money put into the account. The Amendment I have offered is an Amendment that would treat everyone the same in this account. At the present time this is a treatment of a class separate and apart from the individual who is on a payroll plan who has a retirement plan at the place he works that he contributes to. Now when the Illinois Income Tax is computed on the individual under a withholding tax retirement system his money is taxed on gross. This would be a separate treatment for the people who would have an individual requirement account that would go into a separate trust that would be nontaxable. This has two hazards because it appears now it would not only be separate and apart on the taxation at the front end when he takes that out of his income and puts it into the retirement account but it also would not be taxed when it is withdrawn from the account. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I object to the Amendment #2 because of the fact that it's going to really emasculate the purposes of this particular Bill which is trying to give justice to the ordinary investor. And therefore I think it's another



attempt to defeat the purpose of the Bill by surreptitious methods. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if we believe in justice for all taxpayers and that all classifications of taxpayers be treated equally, we should defeat this Amendment and pass out Senate Bill 1853."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #2. Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion...Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Deavers: "The Amendment Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur, will you yield to Representative Deavers?"

LaFleur: "Yes."

Deavers: "Lee, you're striking out Section 402-a; 402-c; 402-d; 403-a; 403-b; 405; 406. Now are you referring to in these sections in the...of all the tax shelters under the IRS?"

LaFleur: "Not under the IRS, the Illinois Income Tax. That's the only thing we're addressing but the...one of the problems that come up under this is the shelter that...that comes through the IRS. Now this Bill picks up a piece of the IRS and makes it apply to the Illinois Income Tax. But it doesn't take into consideration the whole. Now as you know, Gil, the Internal Revenue Service is the federal government is moving quite alertly in the direction of certain shelters and especially in the areas of retirement. Now what this would do would get us out of whack with the federal government and also set precedent. Now what I'm trying to do with the Amendment is to treat everybody alike. Now the...the Sponsor said this is emasculation and sobeit if that's what it is. But after this Amendment is placed on it each person would be treated identically instead of separating out trusts for the Illinois Income Tax special treatment."

Deavers: "If I set up an IRA account, do I pay the 2-1/2% state income tax on that?"

LaFleur: "Under this Bill...under this Bill you would not. You do at



JUN 30 1978

103.

this time. But if you set it up as a self-employer where you would take this under the IRA and you get a deduction of up to \$2500, I believe it is, then you could relieve yourself of Illinois Income Tax up to that \$2500. Now what this does not do, it does not treat equally the same the people who are on a payroll who are contributing to a...a payroll deduction retirement system..."

Deavers: "Tax shelter annuity..."

LaFleur: "...Because there it is taxed on the gross and not on the net."

Deavers: "And you're trying to create a situation where the IRA, the TSA, will all be treated the same under Illinois tax?"

LaFleur: "That...that is right."

Deavers: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schuneman?"

Schuneman: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schuneman: "Leo, I think I'm beginning to understand what you're trying to do on this Amendment. Does your Amendment stem from any kind of concern on the part small tax on the state income tax which has very few deductions?"

LaFleur: "You are right."

Schuneman: "In other words if we're going to exclude certain income... certain matters from the state income tax then we'd better go all the way and adopt the federal income tax laws with all the deductions and exclusions and loopholes and this sort of thing? Is this...is this fear what prompted you to introduce this Amendment?"

LaFleur: "Well, it wasn't ...it wasn't fear and it was based entirely upon the retirement plan knowing that the federal government is working quite alertly in sheltered money for retirement. Now I think we should be in concert with the federal government not out of step with the federal government. Now if we pass this they're going to come down with more rules and more law and it's going to put us out of step farther. Plus the fact, the reason for the requiring of a fiscal note it would a cost



JUN 3 0 1976

to the state of Illinois loss of tax dollars but it would also make a complicated system of filing for the Illinois tax plus the fact that it would not treat each one equal so in your original assumption of the many deductions that are allowed under the federal this would only be one but it wouldn't treat everybody equal so there should be more, there should be different ones."

Schuneman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Any further discussion? Representative LaFleur to close." LaFleur."

LaFleur: "This...this motion is a simple motion that tries to get to the root of this problem and not take special interest in one... one class but treat everybody equally and the same. And if this motion is adopted then everybody will have an equal opportunity of this sheltered money in regards to the Illinois Income Tax and their own retirement plan. And it would certainly face that they'd all have an equal opportunity to save the money that is now being offered in the Bill by no matter what retirement plan they are whether it's a payroll deduction or whether it's an IRA account by the Illinois State Income Tax. I move for the adoption, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1853. Those in favor say aye; opposed, no. The Gentleman...the no's have it and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Conference Committee Reports is the order of business. And on Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 3952, Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3952 was adopted unanimously by the Committee. It simply puts the judicial ballots for the November election on the machines. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Question is on the Gentleman's motion ...Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the First Conference



JUN 30 1976

Committee Report to House Bill 3952. All 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 142 aye and no nay and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3952. 3318. There goes the Lone Ranger. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the correct Conference Committee Report, it's on everyone's desk and 3318. It's the Minimum Wage Law and the Conference Committee met and considered the three Senate Amendments that were adopted by the Senate and rejected by the House. And we come to a compromise solution of the three Senate Amendments. Number one, the Senate recede from Amendment #1, 2 and 3 but we put back in that for an employer employing fewer than four were the House Bill...the version the House Bill said...no exemption. We have now returned up to fewer than four employees exclusive of the employer's parents, spouse or child or other members of his immediate family. That is the language in the farm exemption of the Minimum Wage and it is a compromise, it's not everything I wanted but it isn't everything that people were against. And then in the agricultural exemption we reverted back to the exact language of the law as it stands today in Illinois. The Illinois Agriculture Association had...allowed and concurred with a reduction of those man-day, man-days to 250 per quarter. This returns it though even if that compromise because of some Legislators fear that we were covering agricultural too closely; we...the Conference Committee has returned that to the 500 man-days per quarter exemption on agriculture. On Amendment #3 we recede entirely and that was in the area of whether the federal limitation would be the maximum that the state minimum wage could ever be. It was felt that it was an inequity that legislation would have to increase anyway, it was a foolish protection really because without legislative change and whether or not we wanted to change it we had the 89 votes and the 30 votes in the Senate to change the minimum wage higher than we also had the muscle or the vote



to change the law that would prohibit that kind of exceeding higher limitations. With that, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I urge and ask for a favorable Roll Call on...the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3318."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Sponsor yield to a question? Tom, in line...in Conference Report you say in lines 22 to 24 of the Bill you delete 2, 3, and 4 and insert thereof 3, 4, and 5. Will you tell us what the deletions refer to and the substantive refer to because I can't quite make this out."

Hanahan: "Yes. We affected in setting up the Bill itself, we affected Provision 1 on page 1 of the Bill, on House Bill 3318, and we struck the 'for the employer employing fewer than five fulltime employees'. We have now replaced that with the language employing fewer than four employees exclusive of the employer's parents, spouse or child or other members of his immediate family. By changing that section we then go down to an employee engaged in agriculture, is number 1, then we...we're reverting that back to number 2. We've changed then number 3 in domestic service about the home and now we're reverting that back to number 3. And that is what it is, strictly technical and has no meaning whatsoever to the intent of the law."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Rayson. Ready for the question. The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3318. Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 aye and 13 no and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report, House Bill 3318. Speaker's table appears House Resolution 939. Representative Giglio. Is Representative Giglio on the floor? Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 108, Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, my Co-sponsor, Representative Dyer and I



are asking...no, we...placed this...we have submitted a request up there to put this Bill on the Interim Study Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Then you want it out of the record in the Interim... Senate Joint...the Clerk suggests that you should table the resolution if the Bill is going to a committee. As long as the Bill is in Committee...Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, I move to table the Resolution..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none House Joint Resolution 108 is tabled. House Joint...Senate Joint Resolution 82, Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to suspend the necessary rules and have this Bill heard and adopted immediately. If the Clerk will read the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has asked leave for immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 82. All those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. 107 votes. ...Voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hill." Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, could I have an explanation of it, it probably was given but I missed it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell, will you please explain the Senate Joint Resolution?"

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a resolution asking to have a committee investigate the practices of placement and...and practices of the Children and Family Division. We've had a lot of problems emanating there that would require, I would think, a committee of Legislators going into this matter to determine some of the practices that are in vogue. We've had Representative Davis, a group of us, had a hearing with the director and her deputy and she is currently conducting an investigation of one of the providers and we have asked all of them to bring in the necessary credentials and records that we requested. Time is running out. I will say that the director's office is cooperating but we feel that this something that should be looked into so that we could when we come back in the fall, if we do, could give the House a very thorough report as to whether or not



our...the indications are now that there should be...should be looked into and corrected and I would ask that the...this Resolution be adopted."

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

Grotberg: "...For a better clarification, Mr. Speaker, I realize we're on the motion to suspend the rules but I see no resolution. I don't know who's going to do the investigating. It doesn't appoint a committee. We've got several activities going on in the area of Children and Family Services. We're well covered in...in plenty of preceding resolutions to accomplish this task but this is the first I've heard about it and I'm concerned as Minority Spokesman of the Human Resources Committee and active on the Children and Family Problems. And I do have some concern that we can address later on if you want to take it out of the record. I'd like to talk about it a little."

Caldwell: "...In fairness to Mr. Grotberg, Mr. Speaker, I got this Resolution this morning, I did plan to talk with the Minority Party and I did ask to have the rule suspended. If you'll suspend the rules and hold it and I'll see if I can talk with him and I'm pretty sure that we wouldn't have any disagreement."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, what was..."

Geo-Karis: "I wonder if I would be in order, Mr. Speaker, to ask that the Resolution be abstracted or read before we vote on it because while I'm voting to suspend the rules I, too, am in the dark as to what I'm doing and I want to accommodate the Gentleman but I would appreciate some abstraction of it."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your pleasure, Representative Caldwell? The Lady has requested that the matter be deferred until the Resolution is honored..."

Caldwell: "I...I would agree with that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. I've been advised that we don't print the Resolutions. How long is this Resolution, Mr. Caldwell? Mr. Clerk, will you read the Resolution? Representative Geo-Karis, be attentive."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Joint Resolution #82. Whereas numerous charges



have levelled against the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, alleging discrimination and the awarding of contracts and the hiring, upgrading, promotion and demotion of personnel. And whereas it is incumbent upon state government to set an example in observing fair and nondiscriminatory practices whether it involves sexual or racial discrimination or discrimination in any other form. And whereas a thorough investigation is necessary to determine the validity or invalidity of these serious allegations of discrimination. Therefore be it resolved by the Senate of the 79th General Assembly, State of Illinois the House of Representatives concurring therein that there is hereby created a special bipartisan legislative committee to investigate charges that the Department of Children and Family Services has practiced discrimination in the awarding of contracts and the treatment of department personnel. That the special committee consist of four Senators and four Representatives; two each appointed by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader in each Chamber. And that the committee report its findings, recommendations to both Houses of the General Assembly by December 15, 1976."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions on the Gentleman's motion for leave? Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, with the understanding that this joint committee is well under and is only on the subject of discrimination. Is that correct?"

Caldwell: "That's correct."

Grotberg: "According to the preamble the Clerk just read, I would think then that I would withdraw my objection. We have a Joint House-Senate Child Care Committee on the subject of child care but I think we would all be relieved not to have to investigate discrimination. I would move the adoption of Mr. Caldwell's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "I think he'll vote yes. Have all voted who wish? Takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Leave for...the immediate consideration 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative



Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, by way of explaining my vote. This is a matter I think that would be to the best interest of the entire General Assembly that are...it could be to misunderstanding, it could be from a lack of minority providers but here's a situation where millions of dollars have...are being spent and from the evidence that have been submitted to some of us we are convinced that the matter should be looked into through the technic that is suggested in this Resolution. All we seek is fairness and...and the only way to do that is to...through the authority of the Legislature to look at the facts in this matter and determine if there is some hanky-panky going on. I don't see anything wrong with this. I think that this is the democratic process and I would hope that we could get a 107 votes to have this matter heard immediately..."

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

Catania: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Catania: "You're allowing him to explain his vote but the board is off..."

Speaker Redmond: "You raising a point of order?"

Catania: "...Can't do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 96 aye and 7 nay and the Gentleman's...motion is lost. Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm lost here. I'm not...I don't think I'm nervous but I asked to explain my vote and the board was locked. I would hope that...and I have a feeling that we could have gotten a 107 votes and I couldn't recognize...so in the...in the light of that, Mr. Speaker, would I be in order to poll the...ask for a poll of the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "You are in order, I believe. Representative Madigan."

Caldwell: "...Appreciate it."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, on many occasions in the past we have extended the common courtesy to other sponsors of bills and resolutions



JUN 30 1976

111.

to take another Roll Call. I don't see that Representative Caldwell is any different than the rest of us, why can't we take another Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. The only problem was a point of order was raised and I had to honor the point. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schlickman: "I heard you clearly say that the motion failed."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "That disposes of the matter."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct but I believe that according to the rules I've learned something since the other day. I think that even after declaring the results of the poll of the absentees is proper."

Schlickman: "Well, that doesn't bother me."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Schlickman: "But that should be the only proper thing at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...that's correct. Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Just by way of...I preface my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'm...I... I would be willing to suggest that you perhaps didn't realize that the...the board was locked at the time that you granted me permission to explain my vote. And it was on that basis because this is what I have anticipated, in...in all fairness and when we realized that the board was locked, then I asked if we could have a poll of the absentees and you agreed. I, of course, am not interested in prolonging anything here; we're just interested in having a fair assessment of this matter and I believe that it would be in order."

Speaker Redmond: "Believe that the Speaker's hands are tied. The... there wasn't any change in the tally for a matter of a minute or two and I kept asking 'have all voted who wish' and there was no change from the 96. Then I told the Clerk to take the record and...I recognized Representative Caldwell to explain



his vote. A point of order was raised by Representative Catania and it was a correct point of order. So my hands were tied, I could nothing except agree with Representative Catania. And Representative Schlickman has objected that I think is right within the rules...."

Caldwell: "There couldn't have been any change, Mr. Speaker, because I know a couple of people attempted to...to vote and they couldn't and that's when we realized that the board was locked..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington. That's an...incidentally when I keep asking 'have all voted who wish' when I tell the Clerk to take the record, that's the necessary concomitant, it does lock the tally and that's what happened. Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the solution is very simple. You did announce the verdict, so to speak, very hurriedly and Mr. Caldwell was trying to get your attention to poll the absentees and your face was diverted toward Mr. Schlickman. In all fairness I think he's entitled to a poll..."

Speaker Redmond: "He's entitled to a poll of the absentees even after the results have been declared, as I read the rule..."

Washington: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "But there...I'm powerless to change the results even if the absentees..."

Washington: "Well, that's another feeling if he can poll the absentees it won't affect the results, what's the point of polling the absentees..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think there's any. Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "I just wonder because I wasn't sure the point of order was raised...made by Representative Catania, and as I understood her point of order, he was explaining his vote; the tally had not been made and therefore he had a right for the board to be open to have a running tally. And...and I think that was the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and therefore if she... her point of order is proper then the declaration of the vote was improper and I think



in order to clarify it you ought to ask Representative Catania if that was really her point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell us the chronology here?"

Clerk Selcke: "The chronology as I understand it is that you repeatedly asked if all voted who wished. Then you told me to take the record. Then Mr. Caldwell got up and asked for a recognition to explain his vote; you granted him that. And he explained his vote. Then Mrs. Catania got up and complained because the vote was...the keys were locked. And once you press this button up here there's no way to unlock it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, then, if that was the chronology, Representative Caldwell has the right, under the rules, to explain his vote until the result is recorded. He also, with that right, has allowed to have the board open with the running tally. So therefore, I think I would join Mrs. Catania in the point of order that the board had to stay open with that explanation of votes."

Speaker Redmond: "You are completely wrong in that regard. The solution to this is somebody who voted on the prevailing side should move to reconsider the vote. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...no...Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I'm on the prevailing side, I'll move to reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentlemen...Representative Schlickman having voted on the prevailing side has moved to reconsider the vote by which the Gentleman's motion lost. Those in favor say aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. The motion to reconsider carries. Now we're back on the Gentleman's motion for immediate leave to have immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 82. Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all Members of the House. I, then would...I then would ask leave to suspend all of the



necessary rules and ask for the immediate adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I'm just suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the board be dumped until the question..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I suggested that it be dumped. And he dumped it and I guess they've started off again."

Schlickman: "Well shouldn't we wait until...is he explaining his vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell, explaining your vote, is that what you're doing?"

Caldwell: "No, Sir, I'm just asking for..."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Gentleman's motion...the question's on the Gentleman's motion, immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 82. Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Don't get shut out. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, briefly explaining my no vote and I know it'll be in a small minority. This is a subject that is very, very serious. It has not gone to Committee. We have no idea whether there's any factual foundation for it at all. It relates to allegations of discrimination on the ground of both race and sex. We do have a Commission on the Status of Women that has done an excellent job and has been funded for \$45,000 to continue their good work to look into areas of discrimination against women and I think that it would be a duplication to create some second additional committee of the House to overlap what the Commission on the Status of Women is already doing and that is the reason for my no vote. There are two reasons, that there's been no committee heard, no facts presented to committee and it's a duplication of another excellent unit of the Illinois General Assembly."

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

Grotberg: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my now present vote on this, I'm doing that because in the first whereas we find that they're alleging discrimination in the awarding of



contracts and then goes on to state about the hiring, upgrading and promotion of personnel. And I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House and Mr. Speaker, that that opens up the whole investigation process of the Department of Children and Family Services. I submit to you that there is a Joint House-Senate Committee working at this matter which was denied, incidentally the other day by most of the proponents of this Resolution the operating money on a separate Amendment to the Omnibus Committee to help us get through this summer and finish up some...not only the investigation but the reporting of the status of the Department of Children and Family Services on the HJR 5 Committee. So I would just warn you to be careful on this. I don't want to interfere in the process of anybody else's resolution except to inform the House there are a dozen avenues to get this accomplished and we'd be glad to hear this problem in the Joint House-Senate Child Care, Joint Committee of the House and Senate that's already going on with its business."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "I think Representative Grotberg is incorrect here. This Resolution addresses itself to a very narrow but obviously serious problem. Allegations that the Department of Children and Family Services have involved themselves in discrimination of letting of contracts. It's just that simple and it says no more than that. Now these allegations are serious. You can't prove a case in a resolution, you simply set out the allegations and the suspicions and where the Committee is going and what you expect to do. It doesn't presuppose anything. And unless it's laid to rest by the investigation these allegations will continue. I think it's an important resolution. It's important to find out if they are true and it's just as important to find out if they're untrue so they can lay this thing to rest. I think it's a good resolution. We should vote it up and get on with our business."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. There will be no explanation of votes now."



On this question there's 93 ayes; 8 no and the Gentleman's motion is lost. The order of concurrence appears House Bill 3411. Representative Van Duynes, 3411."

Van Duynes: "...Wait so long, Mr. Speaker, I forgot where I was at."

Speaker Redmond: "Springfield."

Van Duynes: "...This is on House Bill...Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is House Bill 3411 and we are going to ask you to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, and 4 and if you'd me to explain them I would. But I now move for concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, is this the First Conference Committee or the second, Representative Van Duynes?"

Van Duynes: "Well, it's concurrence."

Ryan: "Would you explain the Amendments please?"

Van Duynes: "Well, we have Amendment #1 which asks for a \$450,000 addition to their budget."

Ryan: "For what?"

Van Duynes: "For personal service of \$37,000. Retirement...it's for operations, Representative Ryan, and also for four hundred and some thousand dollars for the housing, part of this department."

Ryan: "Well, what's the total addition of Amendment #1?"

Van Duynes: "\$450,000. \$397,000 for the housing and \$53,000 for operation."

Ryan: "All right. That's the only Amendment?"

Van Duynes: "No, we have Amendment #3, which is the \$111,000 addition that was cut out of NIPC and I ask for a concurrence in that. This is in addition, that it was taken out by the Senate.... Beg your pardon?"

Ryan: "That's an addition of 111,000?"

Van Duynes: "Yes. 800."

Ryan: "What is it? 800?"

Van Duynes: "A \$111,800."

Ryan: "Okay. What else have you got?"

Van Duynes: "And then we have a reduction in Amendment #4 of \$31,000 in operations."

Ryan: "Is that it?"



JUN 30 1976

Van Duyne: "That's it."

Ryan: "What's the net change then, Representative Van Duyne, do you know? About \$530,000?"

Van Duyne: "Now, this...listen, let's get back to the Amendment #1. Really there is not...no addition."

Ryan: "I don't have that on 1, Representative Van Duyne. My...my records show that you've got the Partee Amendment on here, the 50% limitation and that it lines out the Housing Fund and it puts a 50% limitation on expenditures, for personal services, travel, contractual, commodities, printing and makes some technical changes. It doesn't show any addition of \$450,000."

Van Duyne: "I'll just read it to you. It adds 50% spending obligation limits to all divisions and all line items to the exclusion of EDP, teller communications, equipment and grants to local housing authorities. Appropriates the Housing Fund which has heretofore not been appropriated and breaks expenditures of FY-77 out of the standard accounts. Adds some \$450,000 to the Bill. Makes technical changes in the Bill by adding language to Section 5 to indicate an appropriation of...for the Federal Urban Planning and Assistance Fund rather than from the General Revenue Fund. It is now erroneously specified. That's the technical language of the explanation."

Ryan: "Well, now on #3, Representative Van Duyne, you said 111,800; I show 148,800 addition for NIPC."

Van Duyne: "Well, that's right, I'm sorry about that. It returns the appropriation for the North Eastern Illinois Planning Commission to the fiscal year 1976 funding level of 206,800 or an increase of 111,800 over the figures shown in the Bill. And the second part of it increases the appropriation for Southern...Southwestern Illinois Planning Commission from 50,000 to 87,000 and this is actually a decrease of 16,000 over the FY-76 funding level of \$103,400."

Ryan: "All right, and then a reduction of \$31,260, Amendment #4. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a division on the question if that's possible."



Speaker Redmond: "It's possible."

Van Duyne: "I would not object, Mr. Speaker, would you be agreeable, Mr. Ryan, to asking for a concurrence on #1 and #4?"

Ryan: "No, let's take them one at a time, Leroy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I...I agree with Representative Ryan as far as the division on the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would it be possible to ask you to turn the light on so that the photographers will not be in violation of the House rules."

Speaker Redmond: "What photographers are there?"

Madison: "We have some on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought he was finished. Thank you. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, is the posture of the House right now to divide the question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Totten: "Well then I'll hold my remarks."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? We're on Amendment #1. The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3411. Those in favor vote aye and opposed vote no. Vote. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 aye and no nay and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3411. Amendment #3."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, this is the restoration of the money for the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission. And also the South...SWIMPAC of the Southwest Illinois Planning Commission. Originally it was \$206,800 and it was cut 111,800 for the NIPC...NIPC and this is the restoration of that and then there's a reduction in the SWIMPAC of 16,400. So I move for concurrence of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

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



I rise in opposition to the motion to concur on Senate Amendment #3 and let me state the reasons. First of all the increase here was not budgeted at all by the Governor and it is above the Agency's request for this purpose for '77 as it appears in Senate Amendment #3. Secondly, this House and the Appropriations I Committee have rejected this funding during this Session. Third, the two Commissions have argued that they need the money to match federal grants. Our information indicates that existing state funds designated for them will more than meet their needs. NIPC, for instance, will have budgeted state and other funds, a total of \$528,000 to more than match the \$501,000 in federal funds for which they have made an application. Further, there's little justification for the additional funds been provided to either House. We are being asked to increase funding for programs and activity that have not been fully spelled out to this General Assembly nor these programs been justified to us or adequately debated. I think the Gentleman's concurrence motion on Senate Amendment #3 is not justified; that this motion should be defeated. And I request a no vote on Senate Amendment #3. "

Speaker Redmond: "Further question? Representative Mahar." Mahar.

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Amendment #3 to House Bill 3411. The \$206,000 that NIPC's asked for for all of these agencies, planning agencies is just exactly what they had last year. Now, over the past number of years their appropriation has been declining. They've been getting money from voluntary agencies and from municipalities and counties and local government in the...in the six-county area. It just seems to me that an agency which is given the responsibility of planning in the area the responsibility of handling federal funds and is...there's a great need for it. And it just seems to me that an agency which was created about 20 years ago either ought to be properly funded or then we ought to do away with it. Now I think that ...I think they're doing a good job. I don't see any reason



in the light of all of the money that's been spent in other areas for all kinds of commissions, committees and investigations and that sort of thing that NIPC can't receive the money that they're entitled to. And I'd urge that we concur with this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the...Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, SWIMPAC is in the middle of a survey on water resources in one of the fastest growing areas in Illinois and they need this support this one more year to complete that project. And so I...therefore I support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? Representative Van Duynes. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I guess the Gentleman who sits before me just pulled my string. He said that we should either fund the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission or abolish it. Well I have all these memories flowing back to me of how the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission sent out a newsletter to everybody in the six county area that was any kind of a power elite type and telling how and why they endorsed the Regional Transportation Authority referendum; how it was going to bring all these good things to all the outlying areas. That is outlying from the city of Chicago and the Loop..."

Speaker Redmond: "You have one minute."

Skinner: "...Also have this memory, excuse me, sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "One minute."

Skinner: "All right. Didn't know I was explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had ten minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Proceed."

Skinner: "I also have this memory of them getting a federal grant to be the waste water planner for the six county area over the strenuous objections of numerous people in the Fox River Valley but not the official city body. You know why the municipalities caved in? It was because of financial blackmail. It was federal grant blackmail. To put it in the argument of one of my opponents



JUN 30 1976

121.

in the fall election who was a village trustee from the city ...from the village of Huntley who incidentally said the RTA buses would be running in Crystal Lake last Labor Day. He said, if we don't...if we don't endorse NIPC as the area waste water planner why we won't get our sewer grants. The Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission is no longer a planning commission and if it's to remain, it's name should be changed to Northeastern Illinois Regional Government. Any organization has this much power over disbursement of federal funds is a government, it is not a planning commission. If and when it wishes to retreat to the role of a planning commission I will be happy to fully support it but since it has just moved into the building owned by the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad and have put up a booth to promote regional government on the northwest passage, I believe it's the northwest passage, anyway the way you get from the Civic Opera building to the Northwestern Railroad station I would wonder if the Sponsor would tell us when he concludes whether any of the money we are appropriating is going to promote this attempt to do away with local government and the influence local governments have outside of the Loop of Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

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

I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. Representative Van Duyne to close."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate some of the arguments that are given against this, truly. Having sat on the Board and having to vote on accepting NIPC as a plan and also the part Representative Skinner brought up about the federal money. But it is fact that some of our local planners really don't have the expertise or the budget or the manpower to even know how to apply for these grants and they do perform some



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUN 30 1976

122.

kind of a function. Now the part about NIPC and the SWIMPAC is really a matter of philosophy. If you believe in planning at all why you've got to give them at least an 'E' for effort. It's a matter of opinion really whether or not they do perform a real function. I happen to believe that there is some good and after all we're not talking about millions and millions and millions of dollars. We're talking about a million for each year of \$148,000. So without belaboring the point any further I would just ask for your concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion the House concur in Senate Amendment #3. All in favor...Representative Schlickman. All in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Representative Schlickman to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in considering our vote on this Amendment; if you're against effective regional planning vote no. If you're against the coordinating of local governmental planning vote no. If you're against local government getting resources that are not presently otherwise available then vote no. If you're against application from local government for federal funding so that they can't get their fair share then vote no. But if you're for effective regional planning, the coordination of local governmental planning, for resource to local government and for local government's fair share of federal funds then vote yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think everyone knows that we are not against the planning concept nor the funding of the planning concept but in the review of the appropriations of one committee both of these agencies did not substantiate the additional request that they requested. Now let me point out to you we asked for a copy of their budget both in the money that they received from the state and the federal government. And upon the review of both staffs in concurrence with the Committee this money was deleted by the Committee. Let me also point to you that this money is above



and beyond even what the Bureau of the Budget allocated for these agencies. If any Amendment should be defeated, it should be this one. I encourage a no vote."

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

Mann: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I...when I first came in the General Assembly championed the cause of NIPC. I would remind Representative Van Dwyne who is very enthusiastic about elected officials and their role that NIPC is not a body comprised of elected officials. They are appointed. They have no constituency. They're supposed to be responsive to the General Assembly but the only time we hear from them is around appropriation time. We have no input into this organization. And they have no interest in us except around appropriation time. I would take a long hard look at what NIPC is currently doing and standing for and then think through this vote. If for no other reason than to single them and remind them that NIPC is a creation of the Illinois General Assembly and that we are its stooges but we are at least on parity with them and to pay some attention to us in terms of their philosophy as expressed in their acts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, do you seek recognition?"

Deuster: "Well, to briefly explain my vote, I'm in favor of regional planning and I'm in favor of planning but I'm voting no because what has happened to NIPC is they have run away with their authority. They've gone beyond what was originally contemplated. They are now in a position, if you'll discuss this with your mayors and local government leaders, they are in a position where they exercise an absolute veto over the right of your people and your communities to get any funds back from the federal government. They've gone way beyond what they should do. Now, of course many of us were concerned about their lobbying, you might say, or advertising on behalf of the Regional Transportation Authority they were telling us in the suburbs that that was the greatest thing for us. And we think they were mistaken."



JUN 30 1976

124.

But I suppose they're entitled to their views. But the most serious defect with them is they are right now occupying the position where they have an absolute right being non-elected people to say yes or no over whether you're going to get your local money back that you sent down to Washington and have made a local application for grant. And I urge most strongly a no vote."

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

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had a couple of people raise questions about my no vote. Well we've had a few people say some of the powers, or tell you, some of the powers that NIPC had but I've talked to some of my mayors and they've told me that they're doing things they don't necessarily want to do but they know NIPC wants them to do it in order to get grants in other areas they know NIPC is going to look at the overall picture of what they're doing. I don't think that's right. I think the reason we elect local people is to do what the local people want and not what some bureaucrat sitting in Chicago wants. And they do have total control over federal funding and for that reason, not because I'm against regional planning or some sort of planning, I am voting no."

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

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Sit down, the Gentleman between..."

Hudson: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my no vote, I would just like to say that the district that I represent and some of the municipal people are becoming increasingly restive about NIPC. Now we created this originally as an advisory group but as has been expressed earlier here it is wrong from the role of an advisory group to one of a bureaucratic monster that in effect holds the municipalities and some of their budgets and plans by the jugular vein. It literally has them in...in its... in its grip and they're beginning to wonder what in the world it was that they created and where this thing is going to go. And I would urge, seriously, a consideration of a no vote in



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

this case."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this concurrence, Concurrence #3 to House Bill 3411. I believe that we ought to place this Bill in this shape and we ought to concur with the Senate Amendments and I don't understand why some of those Gentlemen up there are voting red or voting present. It seems to me that there's some hidden agenda; there's some issues here that are not being discussed about which will lead us to late conference committees and a lack of straightforward dealing of this Bill on its own merit. And I'd urge some leadership maybe from our side of the aisle, maybe our Majority Leader might want to comment on this issue. He's not taken a position yet although I see that one of our leaders has voted aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because we have had such a big vote against this Amendment should indicate to all of us that something is radically wrong. I think the best thing to do is to reject this Amendment; send it back to Conference Committee because the NIPC people have had a terrible idea of the complete ego that only they know everything and no one else knows anything. And I resent it as much as a taxpayer not only as a Legislator and I hope this is defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've heard them say the the jugular vein and its monster that we've created and all the lack of integrity and responsibility of this department. You know we've got a Department of Insurance that we had a budget for just the other day here and we've heard all the ...the same loud cries of disapproval from that organization. And they had a much bigger budget but it was still approved. Representative Merlo stood over there and said if you want to



JUN 30 1976

126.

wipe out this...that part why go ahead. We've got a Department of Public Aid that takes \$2,000,000,000 of our money every year or especially this year. And still and all we funded that. The DOT is the same thing. We're...each time that...that NIPC has to be funded it's got to be approved by this Body and if not this Body by the local or county government. Now we're talking about \$148,000 not a 148,000,000 and I can't see why that everybody is so concerned over a small amount of money and take out all their petty grievances on these people. I am no friend of theirs exactly but on the other hand I don't really see why you should persecute them either."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 80 aye and 70 no and the Gentleman's motion fails. Amendment #4. Amendment #4, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm giving, being given clues here that it has to go to a Conference Committee anyway and so I would just move to not concur in Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to not concur in Amendment #4. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Would he want to amend that to include 3 and 4 so we have everything gone?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, yeah, he amends it to include 3 and 4. Is that right, Representative Van Duyne?"

Van Duyne: "Beg your pardon?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea requested that...wanted to know if you wanted to include 3 and 4 in the motion to nonconcur."

Van Duyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, evidently I'm getting some false information here because now I'm advised that if the Senate would recede from a suggestion then the Bill would still be in order, so maybe I can just change my direction here and explain #4. It's a reduction in the line items here, practically all the way through their operating budget, or at least this part of it, and it's in the amount of \$31,260. So if you would allow me I will change my motion and just move for concurrence in Amendment #4."



JUN 30 1976

127.

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion that we concur, the House concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3411. 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 118 aye and no nay and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3411. Representative Stone."

Stone: "For the purposes of an announcement, Mr. Speaker, the Second Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1650 will meet..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Stone: "In the hall east of the hall of the House at 3 o'clock sharp."

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

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have some information from the Chair. Representative Schlickman is telling me here that because Amendment #3 was not concurred in that now my...my direction should be to make a move by the House to not concur in Amendment #3 then it would go back to Conference Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct. Gentleman has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3411. Those in favor say aye; aye; opposed, no. Motion carries. Representative Skinner. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, could you tell us when the next supplementary calendar will cross our desks?"

Speaker Redmond: "Just hit my desk right this minute."

Skinner: "And could you tell us where the Conference Committee Reports that went to the printer approximately two hours ago is?"

Speaker Redmond: "I haven't any idea. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to suspend that portion of Rule 68 that would require conference committees to be on the calendar and to be on our desks for a period of three hours. Now I've discussed this with the Republican Leadership and offered to them that if we did suspend the Rules that they would be on...we would hold them for at least a half an hour before they're called. And I wish that the Members would read



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUN 30 1976

128.

all the portions of that rule because it says very succinctly that if a bill is in conference committee and not acted on by June 30th the bill shall be tabled. So I would now move, Mr. Speaker, to suspend that portion of the rule that require a conference committee to be on our desks and on the calendar for three hours and make the commitment that no bill would be called until it had been on the calendar and distributed at least a half hour."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I object and object very strenuously to the Gentleman's motion because there's simply no point to it. The rule is there for precisely these last few days of the Session and I suggest parenthetically that the Gentleman was the Sponsor of a joint rule which incorporated this and that joint rule because of his sponsorship, I'm sure, passed the House and was not adopted by the Senate. We have offered the Gentleman that on an individual basis certainly we will agree to suspend Rule 68-B for the consideration of a particular conference report. But to give this blanket authority is just unwarranted and unjustified and I would urge that everyone vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Well, I would appreciate the support of the Members on this motion. The rules made for the protection I agree with the Assistant Minority Leader on that in the closing days. But not really in the closing minutes and the closing hour because we have to have some time to finish our work and the strict interpretation of this rule could mean that we could be in a deadlock in the final hours and I don't think any of us want that. I think the agreement that no bill, no conference committee reports will be called without at least a half hour after being on the calendar is a good agreement. I'm sure the Assistant Minority Leader trusts the rest of his leadership and the rest of the Membership on both sides of the aisle and I think that's all we need. We don't want to obstruct the final hours of the General



JUN 30 1976

129.

Assembly at all and this Bill could do it. It was a strict interpretation so I request an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Gentlemen please be in their seats...can't see Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "...I doubt that anyone in this House questions the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, please be in your seat."

Telcser: "I doubt that anyone in this Chamber questions the sincerity of Representative Matijevich. But I think he full well remembers that this kind of rule and others were adopted with the feeling of reform. The Members of this Assembly have felt for a long time that too many times the Leadership makes deals and we adopted rules like this to protect the Members. And let me tell you the deals are made in the closing moments of the Session and that is the time when we need that kind of rule to protect all of us. And so...and let me tell you I've been on the other side of the fence, on the other side of counter, and I...just from my own experience this is the time of the Session when everyone has to watch very closely at every conference committee report. So, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I hope that you oppose the Gentleman's motion because it will only protect your rights as a Legislator to vote the way you should vote because you're going to go home tonight, tomorrow morning and you're going to have constituents ask you why you voted for one thing or another and you won't be able to tell them why. So vote against the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, this is for the freshman Legislators that are here. This Gentleman served under Speaker Blair and he is an authority on this subject."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can point out to you that there's really not any problem when you go back to your home district because if you're on good terms with some of the Members from the other side of the aisle and



JUN 30 1976

130.

you happen to walk out of the Session and not know what you didn't vote on you can always call up a representative as Representative Telcser did and ask me why he didn't vote on a measure and I explained to him that it was a little bit of the Republican stalling and a little bit of their pouting and that they had walked out and that's why he hadn't voted on my good Bill. I said I didn't hold it against him; said that I wouldn't hold that against him when he got back in the district so I suggest that if you keep a spirit of bipartisan support of this Amendment then we'll all be able to run much more smoothly and get the work of the House done."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "As a freshman I certainly would like to have a chance to at least look at what's put on my desk. And not being privy to some of the things that went on before I am learning and I think that those of us who are new need to have a little longer time to look at these pieces of legislation because we got a pink slip and you know that may be a dismissal slip and we want to make sure that it's something else. So I urge that we oppose this and keep these rules so as to protect us newcomers if no one else. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we all remember what a mess we had with the Agreed Bills list last year and this is what it's going to be this year if we accept this motion. I, too, would like to know what I'm voting on on the conference reports because I'm still going to have to answer to our constituents and I certainly would like to speak against this motion. If we spent this much time a few more hours won't hurt us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly see no reason to try to disrupt this General Assembly but I would like to ask those people who were surprised when Representative Shea and his colleagues from Chicago voted for a concurrence of the Transportation Bill last



JUN 30 1976

131.

year-last night, it seems like last year-which I consider a superb piece of psychological warfare. That...we must watch every conference committee going that comes in. We have won a victory. We have cut the appropriation for the RTA next year by about the same amount that applies to an increase in CTA fare will...will raise and I wouldn't want to lose that victory for two-and-a-half hours; assuming that the half hour holding period which would not be a part of the rules would be adhered to."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last night the Speaker demonstrated, I think, that he has indeed the capacity to be a speaker of all the Members of this House when certain Members on the other side of the aisle chose to use the time of this Chamber for long and hostile comments to the detriment of the whole Body. Those same people now having used up all that time in the waning hours are asking to deprive the Membership and the Minority of one of the few protections it has. I would hope that the Speaker would not feel the responsibility for having lost that time and that the Speaker would continue to function as the leader of all this House and discourage this last minute attempt to arbitrarily deprive us and the public and the media of the opportunity of carefully deliberating the last remnants of argumentative politics that's left here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the acting chairman of the Rules Committee would be available to explain to the Body as to how this provision got into the rules? Mr. Speaker, I...this is rather a curious provision in the rules in light of the logjams that we encounter at this time of the Session and I'd be very interested in knowing who proposed this? The discussion that occurred. Comments on either side of the issue. Would he be available for that purpose?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."



Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the respected Member of the Leadership from the other side is wasting our time. He's a Member of the Rules Committee and if he wasn't there during the deliberations that's his fault. His point is entirely out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I'd like to thank Mr. Duff for referring to me as respected. Thank you, Frank."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, again, I renew my motion and I find it rather ironical that the chief dealer from Reno talks about deals..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative 'Silk,' for what purpose do you rise? Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, although the Gentleman didn't use my name, I know who he meant but I wanted to know if he wants a command performance give me the gavel for three more days and we'll settle everything."

Speaker Redmond: "Over Collins' dead body."

Shea: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the appropriate provisions of Rule 68 requiring three hour's notice on the calendar, 107, for a conference committee report can be considered the question is on that motion. All in favor of the motion vote aye and opposed vote no. 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Maragos. Aye. Have all voted who wish. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry if it's in order."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, this...this vote...this measure requires a 107 votes because it is a joint rule, is that not correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Takes 107 to suspend; 68...Rule 68..."

Madison: "This is not a joint rule?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. 68-D is the House Rules."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk



will take the record. Anybody want to explain their vote?  
On this question there's 89 aye and 59 no and the Gentleman's  
motion lost. Representative Washburn, for what purpose do  
you rise?"

Washburn: "We couldn't understand your wording on the outcome of this  
vote. We couldn't understand whether you said failed or prevailed,  
Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "I said the motion failed. Senate Bills Third Reading.  
Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1679. Repre-  
sentative Berman."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1679. A Bill for an act to amend the  
School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1679 increases the maximum  
amount that can be awarded in a scholarship award from the Illinois  
State Scholarship Commission by \$50 from the maximum limit of  
\$1500 to \$1550 effective with the forthcoming school year which  
starts in August. Some 30,000 students enrolled in nonpublic..non-  
public colleges and universities would be eligible for this  
school award level. A fund to support the increase of a million  
and a quarter dollars, one and a quarter million dollars was  
added into the FY-77 Appropriations Bill for the Scholarship  
Commission. This is a response to the recognition of the increase  
of the tuition costs in almost everyone nonpublic schools in  
the state of Illinois. I solicit your aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is, shall this Bill pass?  
Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who  
wish? Have all voted who wish? Kempiners, no. Have all voted  
who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question is a  
116 aye and 5 no and the Bill having received the constitutional  
majority is hereby declared passed. 1680. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, during the debate on the  
suspension of Rule 68-B. The Majority Leader graciously said  
that he would give us a half hour if we suspended the rule."



We just had a calendar dropped on our desk that has several items on it and it's Supplemental Calendar #2. The time is now five minutes to three; this calendar is date-stamped 1:30. Now if the Majority Leader had his way this, the items on this calendar would have been called just about an hour before we received the calendar. Thank you."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1680. A Bill for an act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington. Representative Washington, 1680."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1680 amends the Motor Fuel Tax Law by changing the period of time a user has to apply for a refund of the tax on fuel used for nonhighway use. Presently the user has two years from the date of use to apply for the refund. This Bill changes that period from two years from the date the tax is paid. Now, no...the Bill has no known physical impact and it's negligible if any and in the case of a change in the amount of the distributor has kept for collecting the tax most distributors collected the maximum 2% anyway. Recently, however, the Department required that distributors justify their cause. To adequately justify their cause though would cost the distributors more than 2% they would keep. In short, what it does is to provide that for processing the collection of the Motor Fuel Tax and instead of being able to deduct up to 2% for cost the distributor would be permitted..."

Speaker Redmond: "House will be in order."

Washington: "The distributor would be permitted to deduct a flat 2% because most people deduct that anyway."

Speaker Redmond: "They do that in the Senate but not in the House."

Washington: "They do that in the Senate but not in the House."

But this applies primarily to the farming industry. Mr. Rigney raised some questions about it. I anticipate he will raise some more. He is of the opinion that this Bill should go farther and we are not at loggerheads about that but I gather that he supports this Bill in a sense it does minimize the bookkeeping



on the part of the distributor and does give the distributor the benefit of a doubt by giving him a flat 2% for processing for tax collection. I ask your support. This Bill passed the Senate by a vote of 4 to 3 ayes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Rigney: "Do you feel that it's very clear in the Bill that the 2% for handling this tax money comes from the State of Illinois rather than the individual using the motor fuel?"

Washington: "I'm satisfied that it does, Mr. Rigney. As you know, we discussed this with Senator Carroll and you and myself, we discussed this, and your question was legitimate but I think as the Bill is written it makes it pretty clear in that section that there obviously is no increase but it simply is attempting to clarify the language for bookkeeping purposes."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might make one comment on the Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Rigney: "With that assurance, I really have no objection to the Bill. I really don't think the Bill does a whole lot. I think we need a new concept in returning this motor fuel money to farmers and those using it for off the road purposes, I think it should be in the form of a credit on their income tax but as the Bill stands right now I don't really have any serious objection to it. I think it's basically kind of a nothing kind of a Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? ...All voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question 132 aye and 3 no. The Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1726."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1726. A Bill for an act to amend sections of an act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet. Representative Richmond."

Brummet: "This is Mr. Richmond's Bill. He came back here and wanted to whip me over this and it's the Clerk's mistake I guess."



Richmond: "No, I really went back...I was hoping you'd take my next one instead of this one. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1726 amends the Finance Act to provide that when the General Assembly makes appropriations payable in specified procedures from two or more funds the Comptroller may establish the appropriation account from one fund and transfer it quarterly the respective amounts payable from other funds specified in the Appropriation Act. A similar provision has been approved by the General Assembly for the last two years. It simplifies the accounting and administrative procedures necessary to expend the appropriations approved by the General Assembly. The Comptroller's Office supports this measure. This proposal differs slightly from that approved in prior years in that the Comptroller will transfers amounts due from other funds quarterly. The provision in effect in the prior two years calls semi-annual transfers. By changing the transfers from semi-annual to quarterly cash flow from the various funds will coincide more closely with actual expenditures. Currently the only two bills affected by this provision are the Department of Law Enforcement for certain appropriations are designated payable 53% from General Revenue Fund and 47% from Road Fund. I think that has been revised. And the appropriation for the Judicial Branch for appropriations are specified payable 75% General Revenue Fund and 25% Road Fund. This measure is noncontroversial and has been approved by the General Assembly each of the last two years and is supported by the Comptroller's Office. It simply provides an efficient mechanism for maintaining the state's appropriation accounts. I therefore urge an aye vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question there's 146 aye and no nay and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1749. Representative Schuneman."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1749. A Bill for an act to establish Worker's Compensation Market Plan. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1749 is the Bill that we amended earlier today to put it in the same posture as House Bill 3604 which the House passed out of here on June 25th on a vote of 134 to nothing. So we're simply amending the Senate Bill, passing it out in the same form as our own House Bill went out of here a week or so ago. And I would move adoption of a motion that this Bill do pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Question is, shall this Bill pass? 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 145 aye and no nay. The Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1756."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1756. A Bill for an act to amend the Down-State Public Transportation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn. Messages from...we'll take this one out temporarily. Messages from the Senate, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a second conference committee on Senate Bill 1524. Action taken by the Senate June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a second conference committee to consider the difference between the two Houses regarding House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 21, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38 of Senate Bill 1936. Action taken by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of



Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a second conference committee to consider the difference between the two Houses regarding House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1956. Action taken by the Senate June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3392. Action adopted by the Senate June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "...1756, Representative Monroe Flinn, is he on the floor? 1802, Representative Schuneman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1802. A Bill for an act to amend the State Finance Act and State Employee's Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1802 is the last in a series of bills sponsored by the State Employee's Group Insurance Commission. This Bill simply provides authority for the state to collect the cost of group insurance for those employees who are paid from trust funds, federal trust funds, university trust funds and so forth, that we can collect the cost of their group insurance from those same trust funds rather than having to charge the group insurance to regular state expenses. Be happy to answer any questions but in lieu of that I would move for the adoption of the motion that the Bill do pass."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Brummet in the Chair."

Speaker Brummet: "Yes, Sir, thank you. You ready for the question? Better have it. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1802 pass? All in favor vote aye; all opposed nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted voted who wish? Let's take the record. On this question there are 142 ayes; no nays; and none voting present. Duff, aye. Senate Bill 1802 having received the constitutional majority is now declared passed. Okay, 1756. Senate Bill 1756."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1756. A Bill for an act to amend the



JUN 30 1976

139.

Downstate Public Transportation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Brummet: "Representative Flinn. St. Clair County."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman this Bill is the one that furnishes the financing to the...for the Illinois share of the Bi-State Developing Agency which is the transportation system in the St. Louis area. This...it is done by furnishing 2/32nds of the sales tax collected in the area that is served and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Brummet: "Any discussion? If not the question is shall Senate Bill 1756 pass. All in favor vote aye; all opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Okay. On this question there are 125 ayes; 5 nays; and 10 voting present. And Senate Bill 1756 having received the constitutional majority, I declared passed. Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "I should simply like to arise, Mr. Speaker, and observe that you are very intimidating since you took the podium there has been no discussion."

Speaker Brummet: "Well, thank you very much. Next Bill. Senate Bill 1853."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1853. A Bill for an act to amend sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Brummet: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1853 deals with the question of giving the investors, the people who are not with large corporations or don't have any extensive pension plans like we do in the Legislature and government; people who are hard-working people and are trying to save their money under this new..."

Speaker Brummet: "Just a minute. Just a minute, please, Mr...for what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur..."

LaFleur: "Under Supplemental Calendar #2 and Rule 68-D, are we complying with our rules?"

Speaker Brummet: "Yes, these are Senate Bills on Third Reading."

LaFleur: "Does that comply with the time on the Supplemental Calendar?"



JUN 30 1976

140.

Speaker Brummet: "There is no time restriction on these. Proceed, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as I was stating earlier, Senate Bill 1853 is an attempt to give justice to these people who are investing in these areas of the new approach to law by the federal government which we call the individual retirement accounts. All the pensioners, all the corporate executives, many of the professional corporations have now plans under the Keough Program and others which which they are given this relief under the Income Tax Law of the State of Illinois. However this new class of people who have been allowed by the federal government to take advantage, to save them money and at the age of 65 go into retirement are not given that approach and not relief under the Income Tax Laws of the State of Illinois. I therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that we bring justice to this people and make this class just as equal as the others who are depositing and investing in...for purposes of retirement. Therefore I ask for an aye vote on House Bill 1853 which was discussed earlier, more fully, at the time of the amendment stage."

Speaker Brummet: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "This Bill was just before us a few minutes ago when there was an attempt to put an amendment on that would make this a bill that could be accepted and be useful to all people. But Senate Bill 1853 gives employees with a new federal individual retirement account pension plan over the average wage earner with a similar pension plan. Employees usually pay state tax on their contributions to their pension plan since their contributions was originally counted in with other taxable wages. Employees with IRA accounts under Senate Bill 1853 would not pay state tax on either the contributions or the individual retirement account or on the benefits received from it once they retire. Self-employed already enjoy tax free contribution and benefits under HR-10, plans previously enacted by the General Assembly. While Senate Bill 1853 may bring a level of equality between self-employed



people and those employed under IRA accounts, employees under regular pension plans are still being discriminated against by having to pay taxes on their contributions. Now since they want equality in this there is no way to give it since you have rejected the amendment that would have brought this into conformity. Now the second point of this is that there was a fiscal note request on this. It has been filed; been filed by the Bureau of the Budget and it shows that there is just no way of knowing the amount of money that this would cost the state because the individual retirement accounts are not available; or the amounts are not available in Illinois because many are held in a trust. Now these are relatively new accounts and so there's no way of determining the fiscal impact on the state. But it does two things. It reduces state income, number one, and it also tampers with the formula of our state income tax and it puts it out of whack with the Internal Revenue Service. Now I would think if you want a purity of system and something that could be enforced and collected then you would not get us out of whack with the Internal Revenue Service because they are going to be the determining body in the long run and not the Illinois Legislature in their way of trying to give equity to a special interest group. I would urge a no vote because I can assure you'll only be back here next year trying to solve this knotty problem you're causing here today."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of Senate Bill 1853 and I think there's been a lot of obfuscation going on concerning what the Bill actually does and what the proposed Amendment was supposed to have done. Under existing Illinois law there are certain federal types of tax deferment programs which are passed on to Illinois taxpayers. In other words, for certain types of pension programs whereby an individual, either self-employed or employed by a business or a firm, they're able to put certain amounts of money into a retirement program and deferred tax payments until upon retirement the money is used and the person pays



tax. Well Senate Bill 1853 merely extends this type of treatment to the new federal programs for individual retirement accounts and retirement bonds. So these are the programs that are available to the little guy who might not be covered by a Keough plan or some other employment plan of tax deferment in a business or profession. So what the Amendment had proposed to do was as one Member said earlier so throw the dirty water out with the baby. It attempted to get rid of every single tax deferment program from Illinois law. Now I don't think anybody wanted to do that, certainly the intention of Senate Bill 1853 didn't intend to do that. Senate Bill 1853 merely extends to the small ...the person without a great deal of income who's not covered by a Keough plan or some other plan of tax deferment the ability to open up an account, put money in it for his retirement and not be able to have to pay tax on that amount of money until he actually retires at which time presumably it'd be a slightly lower income tax bracket and he would then pay taxes at that time. I think it's a good Bill, it extends the existing program to the little guy and I would certainly suggest an aye vote."

Speaker Brummet: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all I should say that I have a conflict of interest on this subject since I happen to represent a young man who is the beneficiary of a multi-million dollar trust. However, I seriously believe that this Bill does help the little guy. It helps the big ones who are beneficiaries of trusts but it helps the little people and the widows whose incomes are protected under their husband's will and whose money is in trust primarily to protect it. On the hand, I think that the Representative from DuPage who commented on the Illinois taxation level on pensions was in error. I tried to listen carefully to what he said, I'm not sure but I believe he said that Illinois taxes pension benefits in the income tax. And the only exemption that was ever passed the Illinois Income Tax to my knowledge was that one which exempted pension benefits



from our income tax. So I don't think it's fair for me to express myself on this Bill without having said that I could be considered to have a conflict but I think that the Gentleman from DuPage is wrong and I thank the Gentleman from Will County who just made some excellent points on the Bill."

Speaker Brummet: "Is there any further discussion? Mr. Maragos to close."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this has been adequately discussed. I can only answer one point that the people who are under the IRA plan have to hold that money until they're 65 but it's not required of any other pensioneer. And therefore we should give them justice in this case and I ask for an aye vote."

Speaker Brummet: "All in favor of this Bill...yeah, are you ready for the question? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1853? All in favor vote aye; opposed no. Have all voted who wish? Some of them want...Mr. LaFleur spoke in debate do you rise on a separate point?"

LaFleur: "Explain my vote."

Speaker Brummet: "I don't believe you can do that according to the rules. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. That...that kind of ruined my record there though we were going along pretty smooth up until that one. On this question there are 135 yeas; 11 nays; and 6 voting present. And Senate Bill 1853 is now passed. I've been forgetting to hit, haven't I? Do what? Okay. Senate Bill 1854."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Brummet: "Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "...1854. A Bill for an act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Brummet: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 1854 does the same thing. What 1853 did to the Income Tax Law this does to the personal property taxes. It does not have any effect on the state revenue; again, we're trying to put the people in this particular classification in the same posture as the other pensioners and we ask



for an aye vote."

Speaker Brummet: "Discussion. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, perhaps I should start this off...I'm probably speaking to 11 Members who don't have IRA accounts. This Bill here probably has different implications than the first Bill. This speaks only to one thing. The money there and personal property tax and this probably only applies to Cook County. But I would think this would be a bad precedent to set also because you're agreeing, if you pass this Bill, that personal property should be collected and under the Day Bill that we passed in 1974 this is already exempt. I don't really know the purpose of this Bill. Apparently there's more back of it than I can see but since this is already exempt by the Day Bill I see no need for this Bill whatsoever."

Speaker Brummet: "Is there any other discussion? If not, Mr. Maragos to close."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Day Bill that Mr. LaFleur refers to does not cover all the points regarding these particular funds. Secondly these trusts and accounts are being taxed in Illinois and in Cook County and we ask for relief as the same as only other pension fund and we ask for an aye vote."

Speaker Brummet: "Is there any more discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1854 pass? All in favor vote aye; opposed no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 124 ayes; 12 nays; and 6 voting present. And this Bill is now passed. Senate Bill 1949, Mr. Palmer."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1949. A Bill for an act to extend the life and change the reporting dates of certain commissions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Brummet: "Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1949 extends the reporting dates of the State's Attorney Study Commission to September 1st, sorry September 30th 1976 at which time there is a repealer. And it also extends for one



JUN 30 1976

145.

year the Model School for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Study Commission. The State's Attorney Study Commission got a late start, things that reports and research that we're doing right now that we think will be of benefit to the General Assembly and also the hard of hearing, or Hearing Impairment Commission I understand is doing good work also and we'll have some recommendations for the next General Assembly. I ask for your vote, affirmative vote, on this Bill."

Speaker Brummet: "Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1949 pass. All in favor vote aye; opposed no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This question there are 127 ayes; 7 nays; none voting present and Senate Bill 1949 is declared passed. Senate Bill 2015. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2015. A Bill for an act to restore access rights to property adjacent to Federal Aid Route 12 in Madison County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Brummet: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's indeed a pleasure to handle this Bill for you. This is a Bill that restores property rights, or access rights rather, in Madison County on Federal Aid Highway 12. And I would move for its passage."

Speaker Brummet: "Is there any discussion? The...Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Byers: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "Restores access rights from certain land, do these rights go to the federal government or to a private person?"

Byers: "Property owner."

Geo-Karis: "Pardon?"

Byers: "Property owner."

Geo-Karis: "Well, now, has this property been appraised?"

Byers: "Pardon?"

Geo-Karis: "Has this property been appraised?"

Byers: "Yes, the District Aid Headquarters in East St. Louis has appraised



JUN 30 1976

it and set a value and he has paid the money to the State of Illinois."

Geo-Karis: "And do you know how much he paid for it when he gave it up?"

Byers: "Yes. Yes."

Geo-Karis: "How much? How much did he pay for it?"

Byers: "This is just for a road into the...from the highway into his property and the dollar amount 8700."

Geo-Karis: "I mean, what I mean is that...had he given up the right for a road on his property to begin with."

Byers: "Yes, several..."

Geo-Karis: "Several years ago, right?"

Byers: "Several years ago and now he's buying it back at its fair appraised...he's paid the state \$8700..."

Geo-Karis: "Well, did he get much less for it when he sold it to the state, that's what I want to know."

Byers: "Pardon?"

Geo-Karis: "When he gave up his property rights, when he sold them sometime ago did he get much less money, that's all I want to know."

Byers: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "How much did he get?"

Byers: "Well, that was back in the 40's and that's before I was around."

Geo-Karis: "Yeah, but do you know how much he got?"

Byers: "No."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Brummet: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate Bill 2015 pass. All in favor vote aye; those opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 123 ayes, 3 nos and 8 voting present. And Senate Bill 2015 is declared passed. Getting onto that. Representative Chapman, are you ready to go on 3068? Has anyone else got anything that they're ready to go on? Mr. Hart, what purpose do you arise?"



Hart: "I wanted to tell you my car's all packed and I want to go home."

Speaker Brummet: "Well good, thank you. I'll bet we can get enough together for a farewell party. The House will be at ease for a few minutes while we see if we can find something to do."

HOUSE AT EASE

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you rise?"

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during this lull in the action here I just wanted to make a little announcement, I hope you'll give me your attention. I want to start by..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Please give Representative DiPrima some attention."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank each and everyone of you for the support you've given me in behalf of the veteran legislation that I've introduced and others have introduced. And I would like to invite you to the American Legion Convention which is being held at the Palmer House in Chicago from the 7th of July to the 11th. Now I will be in the distinguished guest room on Friday the 9th of July at 11 a.m. Now if you want to mark this down I want to invite each and everyone of you; that would be in Room 2050 and 52W. And I will be there and Senator Bob Mitchler, and Phil Collins is always there with us, and we will personally escort you up to the podium and have the State Commander Ed Brandon make you a distinguished guest of the convention. The VFW, the AMVETS and the DAV have already held their convention so..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedrich: "Would the Gentleman respond to a question?"

DiPrima: "Go ahead."

Friedrich: "If we're to be distinguished guests now, are we included in that transportation arrangement we passed around here where we get free transportation too?"



DiPrima: "Yeah, go and see, what's his name?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative DiPrima, would you respond to the Gentleman's question?"

DiPrima: "Yeah, what's the question?"

Friedrich: "I was just asking if as distinguished guests we'd be entitled to the free transportation..."

DiPrima: "I will personally pay for your transportation. I'll get Kucharski to take care of it."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative DiPrima. Representative DiPrima. Representative Barnes wanted to know if Representative Telcser was included in that invitation to this..."

DiPrima: "Yes, he's included."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Jim Houlihan in the Chair."

DiPrima: "He's back on the team."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Chambers will be at ease after..."

DiPrima: "Now, wait...let me...now, once again, get your pencils ready now. July the 9th, Friday, July the 9th at 11 a.m. in the distinguished guest room, that's room 2050 and 2052..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative DiPrima, in your legislation is there a definition of distinguished guests?"

DiPrima: "You're all distinguished guests in my book."

Speaker Houlihan: "The House will stand at ease."

DiPrima: "Okay."

HOUSE AT EASE

Speaker Houlihan: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate adopted the following Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1621. Adopted by the Senate June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate adopted the following Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3820. Adopted



by the Senate June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Daniels for the purpose of an announcement."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on our side of the aisle we're passing out a bunch of dilly bars here and we have the Legislative dilly award of the Session and we wanted to present it to Representative Stearney and we can't find him. We feel..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Stearney is on a Conference Committee of two."

Daniels: "We feel he deserves the dilly of the award."

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

Matijevich: "As usual Representative Stearney is dilly dallying."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Shea, are you nervous? The Chair recognizes Representative Shea, the Majority Leader, for the purpose of a motion."

Shea: "I have a Senate Bill 1250 that I'd like to take and put an enacting clause back in."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Cook moves to reenact the enacting clause in Senate Bill 1250. All those in favor say aye. Representative Beaupre, for what purpose do you rise?"

Beaupre: "For the purposes of an announcement, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Proceed."

Beaupre: "We've had the German dinner and the Soul Soiree and I wanted to announce that we would have the French Bloc dinner tonight. Leo LaFleur and I will have dinner with our wives at the Mansion View and you're invited to join us for desert. The main course is roast 'lame' duck."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Bluthardt, for what purpose do you hold an ice cream bar in your hand?"

Bluthardt: "For the purpose, Mr. Speaker, to requesting that good voice of ours Rollie Tipsword to sing a song, something like Lavendar Blue Dilly Dilly."



Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if either the Minority Leader or Mr. Walsh are on the floor? It appears to me that on Supplemental Calendar #2 that there are five Conference Committees Reports that are ready to go and I'm just wondering if they would like to go along and suspend the rules for those five or shall we just recess for about a half an hour or 45 minutes?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Telcser, you're supposed to be in your seat when you speak to the Chair. Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you rise?"

Walsh: "I rose to respond to the Gentleman in that it would appear on these five Conference Committees that I would have no objection to calling them now, suspending Rule 68-B for that purpose."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, then, I would ask unanimous consent to suspend Rule 68-B so we could hear the Conference Committee Reports. Do I have leave?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Is there leave?"

Walsh: "...Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "For those specific Conference Committee Reports."

Speaker Houlihan: "For these specific Conference Committee Reports, is there objection? Representative Mann. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Then let's see if we can get a 107 votes and if we can't we can just recess for the 45 minutes."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman moves for the suspension of Rule 68-B in reference to Conference Committee Report, Senate Bill 1621, Senate Bill 1999, House Bill 3377, House Bill 3392, and House Bill 3417. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote no. This motion will take 107 votes. Representative Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what my objection is. On our side of the aisle they're putting one man on every single Conference Committee and they're not responsive to what the people want with regard to that Bill whether they're sponsors of the Higher Education



Committee or anything else and it's undemocratic and it's wrong and I don't think any Conference Committee should go through until it's rectified."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all those voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 ayes; 14 nos; 11 present. And the motion to suspend has carried. On the order of Supplemental Calendar #2, Conference Committee Report, Senate Bill 1621. Representative Richmond, is he in the... Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I request...I move that we adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1621. This Conference Committee Report recommends that the House recede from House Amendment #1 and that Senate Bill 1621 be further amended as follows, on page 1 by deleting line 25 and inserting in lieu thereof 'for grants and programs to Illinois art' and on page 1 by inserting immediately after Section 2 the following 'the sum of \$125,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary' is the appropriation of the Illinois Art Council for grants and aids to ethnic art organization. Actually this Bill, or this Conference Committee Report does nothing whatsoever to the original Bill except add that one line item which change was made in the interest of answering concerns of numerous Legislators who represent districts with many ethnic communities and organizations. Although more money was sought for this line item it was determined by the Committee that \$125,000 would be the proper amount as a pilot program. I ask for your aye vote."

Speaker Houlihan: "Any discussion? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a perfect example of a Conference Committee at work producing exactly what a Conference Committee shouldn't produce. The First Arts Council Conference Committee was not approved and in that First Conference Committee Report this budget had gone through from what the Governor had requested, the Agency



JUN 30 1976

had requested and not one grant or line item had been touched. Almost every other, in fact I don't know what exception of an agency that had not been reduced or amended in some fashion to show the will of this Legislature. Now it doesn't surprise me with the lobbyists been put together on the Illinois Arts Council that this appropriation comes before us without a single dollar cut. But what the Second Conference Committee has done is added money and a new line item for something which not one Committee of this Legislature had discussed nor had the General Assembly discussed and it was finally brought up in the First Conference Committee when we line itemed the figure 'for ethnic group' and taken out of the existing appropriation. Now apparently the Arts Council didn't want that and what we've done in the Second Conference Committee Report is add money to already inflated budget. We've added an additional \$125,000 for an entirely new line item for an agency that probably shouldn't even be in existence in the first place. And I think that this Conference Committee should not be adopted even though it is the second report you know darn well what's going to happen with that omnibus bill when we get into the last moments, the Arts Council can be reworked into a fashion that's more feasible for this General Assembly and for the people of Illinois and I request a no vote on the Second Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Representative from Cook, Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Houlihan: "He indicates he will."

Jones: "Representative Richmond, will you define for me what is meant by ethnic as it is laid out in this Bill?"

Richmond: "I will try. I think that it would mean that minority groups, ethnic groups of various origins that are so prevalent in our urban areas."

Jones: "I'm quite sure that you participated in the Conference. Perhaps you could tell me how do the Arts Council describe or what is the Art Council's definition of ethnic."



Richmond: "I'm sorry I don't think I have a definite, I've heard any definite definition of the word, Representative Jones."

Jones: "Well, actually as far as the other line item in the budget for grants and programs to Illinois Arts, couldn't ethnic group be included in there?"

Richmond: "Well, it presented some problems with the Agency that in their discussion with the Committee it was felt it was meant to single this one item out as a line item and to present it as a pilot program and because of the great interest in increasing this particular part of the program among the ethnic groups, particularly in the Chicago area therefore it was set out as a separate line item."

Jones: "In FY-76 was there any money appropriated or any grants given to ethnic groups?"

Richmond: "Yes, there was."

Jones: "How much was that?"

Richmond: "One moment, please. In '76 a total of \$124,357. This is broken down as minorities, \$56,990. Ethnic, 567. And in the combination of the two, Minority Ethnic \$48,800."

Jones: "For ethnic alone then you have about \$18,000 that was appropriated last year."

Richmond: "Yes, that's..."

Jones: "But it was not a specific line item."

Richmond: "No, it was not."

Jones: "So therefore, in other words, this particular line item is really a 600%, approximately 600% increase just for ethnic alone. But one of the things I'd like to address myself to, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is simply this, I'm quite sure many groups fall into this particular category. I'm quite sure the Polish, Italians, my good friends the Irishmen, the Lithuanians, the Czechs and I don't know about the Jews whether they fall into this category or...I know the Germans, too. And I'm quite sure that some blacks even fall into this category, am I correct? Afro-American descent. Well, actually what we have here then is



really a duplication of appropriations then. We really don't need this particular line item because we also fall into this other category and that is the grants for programs of Illinois Art. They will also qualify for that particular line item so this is really a duplication of appropriations and I don't think we should approve this Second Conference Committee Report because I sometimes wonder how my friend Sammy Davis, Jr., falls into this category. I looked up the dictionary definition of ethnic and it says 'neither Christian nor Jew' and they don't fall into that category."

Speaker Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to be recognized, that's all."

Speaker Houlihan: "Continue, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think that we should really therefore appropriate money for the Illinois Arts Council and in particular a special line item for ethnic groups because in my opinion everyone falls into the category of a mass grant and that is...award for the grant for Illinois Art and Cultural Development. Everyone falls into that category and so this is really a waste of money and I don't think this particular \$125,000 is needed."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman. For what purpose do you rise...excuse me, Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise, Representative Collins?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I rise on a point of order. Would you ask the Clerk to give us the names of the appointees to this Conference Committee?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Would the Clerk read the names of this Conference Committee Report?"

Collins: "Not the Report, the appointments. Mr. Speaker, well I have a copy of the message from the Senate to the House over the signature of the Clerk of the House John O'Brien, stating that the conferees to be: Representative Richmond, E. M. Barnes,



Gerald Bradley, Ryan and Totten. Now all those Gentlemen did not serve or at least one of the Gentlemen was replaced by another signature on the Conference Committee Report which I submit to you invalidates this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative..."

Collins: "There are only six signatures on this Conference Committee Report, removing this one which does not belong on there would result in five signing and therefore the Conference Committee Report would not be valid."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Collins, are you referring to the call for the First Conference Committee or the Second Conference Committee?"

Collins: "No, no, the Second one."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "I rise, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in support of the question that was raised by Representative Collins. I think he's correct. I think if you look at the message that was sent to the Senate from the House it did include E. M. Barnes as he foretated. As far as E. M. Barnes is concerned E. M. Barnes was willing and intending to attend this Conference Committee as I have attended all others that I was appointed to. And the next thing E. M. Barnes knew was the Conference Committee Report would come floating around without E. M. Barnes name attached thereof. No explanation. No explanation. None whatsoever was either asked or given to me for my being taken from this Conference Committee. Now the point that I'm making is I'm not indispensible and I don't make the statement in that fashion but I think just a plain courtesy should have been involved if I was going to be taken from this Conference Committee. Now I've served on many, many Conference Committees here this year and last year. I did not serve on one this year but at least that courtesy was given to me, the Leadership came to me and informed me that another Member wished to serve on that Conference Committee which I had no problems with. I think, I think I know the reasons that I was not appointed to



this Conference Committee and I think that the reason is is that the fact I laid out here, the fact that was laid out by Representative Totten is absolutely correct. The Arts Council is simply adding money on top of money on top of money. This is the only, the only, that I know of Agency that came through Appropriations II that did not get any cut whatsoever in their General Revenue Fund. I, for one, might have supported that Conference Committee Report but in the fashion that it was done in and the manner in which it was handled with no one, no one, extending at least that courtesy to me and then to bring out a Conference Committee Report and say this is what the conferees agreed on. It's a sham. I did not attend. I was appointed to it and thus the facts of life that's involved in this Second Conference Committee and I suggest to the Members of the House we should treat it accordingly. It should be defeated."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal more than courtesy involved here. I think Mr. Barnes' removal and his replacement should be formalized and I don't believe that was done."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Clerk is checking on that inquiry. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative McAuliffe, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Ryan, continue."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I personally resent the action that's been pointed out here by Representative Collins. He's absolutely right. I've been along with Representative Totten on almost all of the Appropriations Committee...Conference Committees and had no idea that they had pulled this trick. Now this is just a good example of why we should not suspend the Rules for the last three hours, right here, Ladies and Gentlemen, an excellent example. I think this is a terrible ploy, it's certainly a mark on somebody's integrity. I don't know who's done this but I've been very, very offended by it and I would suggest to the Sponsor of this Bill that he



pull it out of the record, get the conferees right and let's go back and do the job that we were supposed to do it, Mr. Richmond, I'm sure, maybe you weren't aware of this, I don't know, but I'm going to tell you I'm very offended by the way ...by the actions that were taken on this Committee."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Lundy, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have two parliamentary inquiries, Mr. Speaker. One is what would be the status of this Bill if the House refuses to adopt that Conference Committee Report?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Richmond, you wish to take this out of the record so the Clerk can clear up the question as to the conferees?"

Richmond: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Houlihan: "We'll take this matter out of the record. ...The Second Supplemental Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1999. And the Conference Committee Report, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge concurrence and adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1999. In the Conference Committee the reason for the Committee was to amend the Bill so that some of the school teachers who would be involved in the economic layoff to apply for pension benefits to purchase out of their own pocket would have been excluded from the...participating in the program if they had retired prior to the time that this Bill went into effect and I would urge adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Downs."

Downs: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The Sponsor indicates he will."

Downs: "What was the result...this was just voted on in the Senate, what was the result there?"

Terzich: "I don't know, Representative, I have no idea what the result was in the Senate."

Downs: "Because as I recall seeing the vote it failed and if that was the



case what would be the point in proceeding here?"

Terzich: "I couldn't tell you. I'm just handling the Bill as part of the Conference Committee and I don't know what action was taken in the Senate."

Downs: "Thank you."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman, is your light on from the previous debate on the Illinois Arts Council?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Speaker Houlihan: "There being no further discussion, Representative Terzich. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Sponsor indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Senate Bill 1999 started off as an Amendment to the Judges Retirement System Article of the Illinois Pension Code..."

Terzich: "Well, Representative...Yes...Schlickman, if I may..."

Schlickman: "...What was...what was House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1999? That open it up to teachers?"

Terzich: "If I may reply to you that Senate Bill 1999 originally was for the Judges Retirement System. A problem was brought forward to us with regard to the teachers who were affected by the economic layoff with regard to their pension. This was completely explained to the Members of the House which I gave the complete explanation, also the economic impact. It passed out of the House 132 to 9 on that basis."

Schlickman: "Well, I'm sorry, I may not have been here but you haven't answered my question. What did Amendment #1 to this Bill do? Did it strike everything after..."

Terzich: "Everything after the enacting clause."

Schlickman: "So the judges were taken out..."

Terzich: "Right."

Schlickman: "The teachers were put in?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you."



Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Terzich to close."

Terzich: "I move for adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Houlihan: "The question is shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1999? All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote no. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all those voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 ayes; 11 no; and 16 voting present. And the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1999 is adopted by a constitutional majority. On the Second Supplemental Calendar Conference Committee Report is House Bill 3377. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm the primary Sponsor of this Bill in the House and it did receive six signatures and however I would like to see the Bill go back to Conference Committee and we've worked out everything in this. This is the Mental Health budget except the agreement for collective bargaining which is \$7,700,000 and everything has been worked out. And I don't know what happened the vote was tied 5-5 and then all of a sudden somebody switched their vote and it was 6-4 but I think it should go back to a Conference Committee and would move so."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman has moved the House do not adopt the Conference Committee on House Bill 3377 and he requests a Second Conference Committee. Is there any discussion? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly agree with Representative Byers. The collective bargaining agreement for 7-1/2 million dollars have been left out of this program. There was some kind of a compromise made, I'm not sure just what it was to add in...to put back some reductions that had been made and...but there's...they've cut in effect the collective bargaining thing almost in half. Is that right, Representative Byers? It's not the package that we wanted and I would concur with Representative Byers that this should go back to a Second Conference Report."



Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Houlihan: "He indicates he will."

Madigan: "Mr. Byers, if this represents a compromise on the issue of funding of the collective bargaining agreement, would you please provide us with some detail as to the provision of the compromise?"

Byers: "Well, the compromise was with Senate Amendment 3 and 4. We had agreed previously to restore \$2,000,000 and then someone made a motion that we restore all the money which was cut which was about 4.1 million for new staff and vacancies and completely give up the collective bargaining money and that's when one of the Members switched their vote to make it go from 5 to 5 to 6 to 4. I personally do not think the Conference Committee represents the true feeling of the House and that's one reason I want to go back."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Byers, I've heard different reports regarding three of these Conference Committees to the effect there was an attempt to provide a percentage increase similar to percentage increase as granted to other employees in the department. Is this the thrust of this report?"

Byers: "This report, the agreement that's been reached between the union representing the mental health workers and the management of the Mental Health Department calls for a 4% agreement and this budget does not provide for them to live up to their legal binding agreement."

Madigan: "Well, in other words, this Conference Committee Report is a proposal to provide part of the funding for a contract to which the Legislature was not a party."

Byers: "It was a legal binding agreement."

Madigan: "Between who, who were the parties to the contract?"

Byers: "An Executive Order issued by the Governor and the Mental Health Department and the ASCPE."

Madigan: "Well, who were the parties to the contract, Mr. Byers?"

Byers: "The Department of Mental Health and ASCPE."

Madigan: "And they negotiated a contract. Were the Appropriations



Committees of either the House or the Senate consulted regarding the contracts and the negotiation?"

Byers: "I was not personally consulted, no."

Madigan: "Were any Members of the Appropriations Committee of either the House or the Senate?"

Byers: "You'll have to ask them."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, sometimes we have sins of commission and sometimes we have sins of omission. Now once in a while it intrigues me that the Sponsor of a particular Bill just gets up on the floor and says I recommend that it go back; everybody says aye let it go back. How do I know that I want it to go back? First of all I've never been a member of any Conference Committee. I don't know what they did and this might be the only chance I have to find out what they did. And I'm asking the Sponsor would he just explain to us what it is that the compromise Committee, or what it is that the Conference Committee did so that I can make up my little mind whether I want to go along with him to go back or I might want to say, hold it right here and let's do this. And I think that ought to be my option. So I'm asking the Sponsor to explain the term of the compromise."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, the House agreed to accept Senate Amendment #1 which was a 50% provision. It's been on many of the Bills that allows...us to only spend 50% up to the first of the year. Senate Amendment #2 was the one that I'm not in agreement with and that was the one that made the reduction in three line items for pay increases for the union employees in the Department of Mental Health which is a total of \$7,695,000. Senate Amendment #3 was a reduction \$2,176,000. Senate Amendment #4 was a reduction of a \$1,510,000. The Senate agreed and ...to put those two items back so Senate Amendment #3 and Senate Amendment #4, we first reached an agreement that we would put



back \$2,000,000 and we went ahead to the other items and when we got back to the collective bargaining agreement that's when we ran into the problem and they decided to throw in all the money that they had originally cut out which we had approved. It went over to the Senate for a total of about 4.1 million. Senate Amendment #5 reduced, and we agreed with this, the Administrators at the various regional offices by \$210,000 (when the House Committee agreed unanimously to accept that Senate Amendment #7 reduced contractual services in the central office and at the same time added some money that was in new federal funds. Senate Amendment #8 which we agreed to 10 - 0 redrafts language in the Grants and Aids Section, there was no dollar changes. Senate Amendment #9 added some new dollars to establish a refund account to repay a hospital for overpayment. Senate Amendment #10 was a...new federal funds that have appropriated from CETA money. This was money that had been appropriated in another budget and had to be reappropriated to this budget. Senate Amendment #11 was similar and the last Amendment #12 there was a mistake, we agreed to correct the mistake, the line had read '\$1,091,000' and it was supposed to read '1,019,000' and a clerk had made an error in typing '91' instead of '19'. So that's what it was all about. Now this, Mr. Ewell,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten. I'm sorry, excuse me, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been listening very carefully and I don't know how anybody else feels about it but this sounds just fine to me. I think it's a very good thing. A very reasonable thing. It's worked out very well, very effectively. It suits all my needs, all the desires I have and speaking for myself I say this is a wonderful thing and I'm glad to see that we're getting some kind of an agreement. I would urge that we don't reject this Conference Committee Report. Well, let's go on and accept this one. I reject the proposition that any bill belongs to the Sponsor, that he has any proprietary rights in it because just as soon as this Bill leaves this House



it binds me and each and every other Member in the House. And I think that if 89 of us happen to think that this is a good Conference Committee Report we ought to accept it right where it is and sobeit. And I would urge 89 Members to join me."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Boyle, Chairman of House Appropriations II."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the crux of this compromise, if you want to call it a compromise, is as follows. Senate Amendment #2 took out \$7,695,100 which is the so-called collective bargaining money, it wiped it out in toto. Senate Amendment #3 further reduced personal services in the General Revenue Fund in the amount of \$2,176,100. Senate Amendment #4 further reduced GRF Personal Services in the amount of \$1,510,900 thereby making a total reduction in Amendment #3 and 4 in the amount of \$3,687,000. When you combine that with the \$7,695,100 that was taken off in Senate Amendment #2 you had over...we had \$11,000,000 total reduction. Now what we proposed as a compromise and I wish you'd be attentive and listen and maybe you can understand it because I'm going to leave it up to you to make up your own mind, what we proposed was that the Senate, that the Senate would recede from Amendment #3 and Amendment #4 which would provide for the restoration of \$3,687,000 of Personal Service GRF General Revenue Fund money. That we would adopt Amendment #2 which is a 7695 cut in collective bargaining funds. Now this doesn't mean that this wipes out collective bargaining, that the state will not honor these contracts. The State of Illinois can use the \$3,687,000 for their collective bargaining agreement. This, I am told by our staff, will provide for the honoring of these contracts through December. It is anticipated that the Department will be in for a deficiency appropriation in December, that they will ask for supplemental money in December and at that time if it is in the Legislative wisdom they can fulfill the completion of these contracts through July of 1977. As I related to you this is



a compromise and I am neither, I am neither recommending it nor am I saying that it's bad. It's something that we tried to work out but I do want to state one thing here today. I highly resent some of the so-called labor leaders in my district calling people on the telephone in Jacksonville and at the School for the Deaf and saying that I am against labor, that I'm against collective bargaining, that I'm against the working man. Now these people have lied to some of the state employees in my district and I hope that they will be men enough to go back and straighten this out. This is a half a loaf package, this will give them their collective bargaining agreements until December. It's the best that we could work out. If it's the will of this Legislature to reject this we'll go back and try for the full 7695 and for the full 3687 for the full \$11,000,000 package. If you want the whole hog then reject this and we'll try for the whole hog. But if you end up getting nothing then be man enough to go back to the people with the unions with the state employees unions and tell them you screwed up by trying to get the whole hog and you didn't want a half a hog. Be capable, be able, be truthful when you represent these unions and don't go back and lie to people and say that people who have always supported labor ran out of you..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Boyle, bring your remarks to a close."

Boyle: "And so I say to you, use your own judgment. This is what the situation is, if you want a half a hog you got a half a hog here. If you want to reject it we'll go back and try for the 11,000,000. But if we can't get the Senate to go along and you get nothing, know full well what you're doing. Make up your own mind on how you want to vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "There's been quite a bit of talk about pork I'd like to take this Bill out of the record for a while."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman requests permission to take this Bill out of the record. Is there...Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, why is that necessary, Mr. Speaker, doesn't he know which



end of the hog he's got here?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Mr. Duff, Representative Duff, he has asked to take his motion out of the record and...Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you know I would suggest that the Gentleman leave it in the record, this is the First Conference Committee, at least we'll get some kind of reading here. We'll have something to negotiate, if you don't we're going to go back and bump heads again. Let's find out what we're doing."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "All right, if that's the will...Representative Ryan join me in this we'll go."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly glad that the Sponsor of this Bill left this piece of legislation where we could act on it in a manner that's reasonable. First of all let me say that those of you who know the process of collective bargaining also know what it means to bargain in good faith. Now whether we like these ultimate settlements that was reached by the State of Illinois and the union involved is a secondary matter. The principle of collective bargaining is what it states. The State of Illinois and the union bargain in good faith, they reached an agreement on wages and I say to you that if we in the State of Illinois aren't going to accept bargaining in good faith with these people who are employees of the state then we are doing a very serious disservice. And whether you like the principle or not we have it and I would say that this Conference Committee Report should be rejected with an overwhelming vote. Send it back to Committee so that the State of Illinois lives up to their commitment in the bargaining process. This is the only fair and just way to treat these employees and I would ask that this Conference Committee Report be thoroughly rejected."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First I'd like to make a parliamentary inquiry and then speak to it if I could. Is it my



understanding that the motion of the Sponsor of the Bill is to not adopt this Conference Committee Report?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers, would you clarify your motion on House Bill 3377 on the Conference Committee Report #1?"

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it makes much difference which way I make the motion, if I make the motion, does it make a difference? I'm just a rookie here and I don't know which way I have the most leverage and..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Will somebody advise Representative Byers which way he has the most leverage?"

Byers: "Where's that fellow that's advising Representative..."

Totten: "Your best leverage is leaning on your crutch."

Byers: "Representative Jaffe..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, knowing that Representative Byers is not on the same side in this issue, I think what he wants to do is move this is do not adopt this Conference Committee Report so we can go back into a second or at least get a reading so we got something to negotiate with and know where we are that's all. What's your motion, Harold."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Representative Byers moves to not adopt the Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 3377 and requests a Second Conference Committee. Representative Totten on that motion."

Totten: "Okay, then I'd like to request of the Chair on a parliamentary inquiry as to whether, as a Member of that Conference Committee, I can offer a substitute motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report. And if I can that's what I so move."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijevecich."

Matijevecich: "Mr. Speaker, why don't we roll with the first one then we're going to find out where we're at? I mean he's responsive to the Bill, roll with that one. If he doesn't have the votes then you go with yours."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten, we will allow the Sponsor the privilege of making that motion first and then if that motion is defeated you may make the second motion. Representative Totten,"



Totten: "Then let me ask the Chair this, how many votes does it take to adopt a 'do not adopt' report and how many votes does it take to adopt my substitute motion? Is it a majority?"

Speaker Houlihan: "On Representative Byer's motion it will take a simple majority and on your motion if we come to that order of business it will require 89 since it will be final action..."

Totten: "Well then I do not think the motion to 'do not adopt' would be significant necessarily to House and the motion to adopt would determine whether we got 89 votes or not to passed it."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten, it appears as is normally and in most cases, in most instances you would be right."

Totten: "I am always right."

Speaker Houlihan: "But we have accorded the Sponsor of the Bill the opportunity to make his motion first. That has been the custom of the House to operate in that procedure and I believe we would probably facilitate things if we move along that order."

Totten: "Well, you know, in view of the fact that the Senate has just adopted this Conference Committee Report it would seem to me that our..that my motion is in order as a substitute motion and a Member of that Conference Committee and that I would like to offer that motion to adopt to determine whether we've got 89 votes on this or not."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "In deference to Representative, the Sponsor, I'm going to move that that substitute motion lie on the table."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten, if you have the required votes to adopt this Conference Committee Report you will also defeat Representative Byer's motion. Could we proceed with his motion? Would you allow us that?"

Totten: "Do you recognize that mine has preference?"

Speaker Houlihan: "In normal situations that would be correct. So this is the custom of the House to proceed with Representative Byer's motion. Representative Byers moves to not adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3377



and request a Second Conference Committee and on that question we'll have a Roll Call. All in favor vote aye and all opposed vote no. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you're in the Chair and you're one of the Gentlemen that's always fraught for fairness. I didn't hear the previous question moved and there were many Members wanted to speak on this issue. And you rang that bell a little soon and I've been down here with my light on quite sometime, Mr. Speaker, and I think that there are other Members seeking recognition also."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madigan. Time for you to help out your Irish brother. We will allow everybody the luxury of explaining of their vote. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote I want to debate the issue."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, you will probably have the opportunity to debate this issue as this motion that it will be defeated."

Hanahan: "The issue before us right now, parliamentary inquiry, the issue before us right now is what?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The motion by Representative Byers to not adopt Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3377."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my yes vote in support of a motion to do not adopt. It's based on a simple philosophy that if you enter into a contract and enter into an agreement what is more sacred than that in this county? A nation built on laws. A nation built on contracts. We're talking about ratification here now of contract law. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a very basic idea of our society is on that premise and if we violate that by adopting a Conference Committee Report that in its truest intent is a clear indication that our word is no good and a contract don't mean a damn thing. I vote aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative...the Chair recognizes somewhat cautiously, Representative Telcser."



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we've got the wrong motion we're voting on..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Telcser, Representative Geo-Karis has had her light on for quite a while, would you mind if I recognize her?"

Geo-Karis: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this union that's involved has it in its contract not to strike and if you want the Teamster's Union in here just go ahead vote against Byer's motion. I'm telling you right now that Mr. Hanahan happens to be right because there's 881 people that are going to be removed from very valuable services for the mentally ill and if you don't give it another Conference Report.....I suggest to you that we vote yes to not concur."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Totten offered a substitute motion to adopt and then Representative Matijevich moved that motion lie upon the table, it seems to me we ought to be voting on Representative Matijevich's motion to table."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Telcser, Representative Matijevich wasn't recognized for that purpose and we are in the middle of the Roll Call..."

Telcser: "Well then what about Representative Totten's motion to adopt then?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten allowed Representative Byer the leave to proceed with his motion. Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, sometimes when we get in the final days the emotions tend to run high and as a result we tend to get off the track of the issue. The problem here is that the compromise that's being offered truly isn't a compromise at all. The problem is that those who are attempting to compromise this issue with this Conference Committee Report are suggesting to the Department that they go ahead with their normal plan of continuing the employment of those who now exist at the new agreed rate and salary level and then



come back in for a supplemental appropriation. Now that just won't work. If you'll note we have put an Amendment in the Senate on everyone of these Bills that the funds, no more than half of the funds can be expended between now and January 1st. Where does that put us? It puts us in a position of laying off hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of employees in these institutions. Now if we do that we... it has a snowballing effect because in order for us to get federal funds from the federal government to help pay the freight in Mental Health Care we have to maintain certain ratios of health care providers and those who are working in health...in these institutions to patients and those being cared for. If we fail to do that by laying off all these employees we're going to end up losing federal funds. So we're really cutting off our nose to spite our face here just because of this collective bargaining agreement didn't have the stamp of approval of this General Assembly. I think that's wrong. I think it's unfortunate when we're dealing with an area that's so critical to the citizens of this state and I would hope we get more green lights up there."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to call the attention to the House that in every Conference that I've been a Member of we've restricted the pay increases to 2-1/2%. We also did that with bills...Appropriations Bills that did not appear before any of the Committees. Now I call the attention of you Members who have universities in your area; we kept the university system to 2-1/2%. Now all of a sudden we have three departments in here that are operating separately to think that they can ramrod through increases through the General Assembly and deny other state employees...they're entitled to those increases also and they want to deny those people those increases. I think we should be consistent and also, Mr. Speaker, I might say it's rather strange to me that somebody



said this morning 'what a difference a day makes'. Well, what a difference a year makes because I see the Governor's people running up and down the aisle fighting for increases this year when last year they were fighting for a 6% increase and what a difference a year does make. I hope that he has the money."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think there is some confusion here on the vote. The motion is to do not adopt. If you don't want to adopt this Conference Committee Report then you are voting green. Let me point out to the Members of the General Assembly there's a 310,000 operations budget that we're dealing with...310,000,000. Of that 310,000,000 the Department has a \$6,000,000 transferability. And the Conference Committee re-stored into this Appropriation Bill some 2.6 million dollars by receding from Senate Amendments 3 and 4. The net reduction in this Bill is \$4,000,000 over that which it was introduced. The Department has indicated that in many areas they can use Amendment #10 which added 1.6 million dollars for filling vacancies which is federal funds. And I see absolutely no reason for us to support this motion to not adopt. We should adopt this...we should use the motion to adopt and get this out of here."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I'm not at all confused by the motion and I'm going to vote aye on a motion do not adopt. This is not a compromise this is a sell-out. The sell-out of collective bargaining that was done in good faith. Now Representative Boyle mentioned something about this Conference Committee Report having a half a hog. Well I suggest to you that it's less than half a hog and worse than that it's the east end of a hog heading west. I vote aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during the course of this debate we have heard..."



Speaker Houlihan: "Representative...excuse me, Representative.  
Representative Byers."

Byers: "Representative Madigan spoke in debate."

Speaker Houlihan: "I believe, Representative Byers, that was on  
the other issue before you made your motion and I will recog-  
nize Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, during the course of this debate  
we've heard many statements..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative Madigan. Representative  
Madison."

Madison: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Representative Byers made  
his motion at the beginning of his remarks."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madison, if you'll recall he made  
his motion and we're now on that order. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, during this debate we have heard  
very strong statements regarding the sanctity of a contract  
negotiated between this Department and a labor union. A con-  
tract requires two parties to the contract and I have always  
been led to believe that the Legislature is an equal partner  
in the business of state government with the Executive. That  
the Executive proposes and that the Legislature disposes. I  
submit to you that the concept of partnership between the Legis-  
lature and the Executive has been violated in this instance be-  
cause not one of us, not one Member of the Appropriations Com-  
mittee in either the House or the Senate was a party to this  
contract or agreement or was even consulted during the nego-  
tiation. That is the issue that is presented to you today.  
Will Code Departments of this state be allowed to go off on their  
own, negotiate contracts, now mind you that will bind you not  
just for one year, but conceivably they could bind you for this  
year, the next and the next and who knows how long the contracts  
will run. That is the issue. It's your duty, your sovereign  
duty, to come to this Body and vote yes or no on appropriations.  
And where is your power to vote yes or no on appropriations if  
you were in a perfunctory manner ratified actions such as



JUN 30 1950

what occurred in this instance."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, everybody seems to feel that this compromise, well many people seem to say that this compromise represents acceptance or nonacceptance of collective bargaining but if you'll listen carefully to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee when he mentioned half of his hog, he said that the half money that's been put out will allow the collective bargaining agreement be met from now until the first of January at which time they would come back. So if you vote not to...if you vote no on this you are in fact accepting collective bargaining even though many people are saying they are not. They are accepting that and what'll happen next year? The next governor will have to come in and raise taxes in order to meet the other half of the obligation. These monies are going to be used for the first half of the year to meet collective bargaining agreement. Now if you're against collective bargaining agreements you should be voting to nonconcur, send it back to Conference Committee and dare them to bring it out with any collective bargaining money in it."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ewell, the clock will keep a little order in this debate."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, in essence I think Mr. Madigan is exactly right. You cannot put yourself into the position where you had the obligation to raise the money. A contract between Mr. Hanahan and Mr. Byers is meaningless to me when they don't put in the money. Now anytime we sit here as an Assembly and we have a twofold duty, raise the money and then spend the money by appropriating it. Once you lose your ability to appropriate money, once you allow yourself to be usurped and other parties, anybody else can tell you how much money you must put in, you're in dire critical condition. And I ask you, where will all those members of any union or anybody else be when it's time to vote for a tax increase. I've been here several years when we've had to vote tax increases and



you don't get the same kind of voice out of the same people. Then it becomes your duty, the duty of some other responsible citizens to raise taxes but not mine because it would affect me adversely in my district. You can't get it both ways; either we're going to take the appropriation, do it as we ought to do it or else let's resort to some other form of government. And I'm glad to vote no."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I could care less about this contract, there's a program change, a very significant program change, that could make us vote no on this do not adopt motion. And that is the grants to Local 7084 dropped 6.8 million dollars while the money for operations of the Mental Health Department are down 4.7 million dollars. Now, if we vote no on this and yes on the next motion we can tell the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities that they have got to close institutions; that is the way this mental health field is going is they just haven't gotten the message. And if we vote no here we'll help give them the message."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know we've been talking about contracts. All right, the contract has been made and it's been signed but what about the patients? Not one damn word has been said about the patient in a mental hospital. Not one word has been said about 681 employees going to lose their jobs. Now let's get on the ball; let's forget about the contract, it's signed. But those patients are there and they're waiting for the care that we promised their families. They could be your mother, my father, or a member of my family. Let's look at it from the standpoint of where we should be looking..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Will you bring your remarks to a close?"

Jacobs: "Just let's take care of the patients, please."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Catania."



JUN 30 1976

175.

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just wanted to set the record straight on one point. An earlier speaker said that we limited the university administrators to a salary increase of 2.5% and therefore we should limit the employees for the Department of Mental Health. That simply is not true, the university administrators got their requested salary increase of 4.5% and I think that everybody here needs to be made aware of that."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get back to the point that Representative Jacobs was talking about and they were talking about the patients in the hospital and these are the employees that take care of that. The people that make the beds, they're the people that clean up, they're the people that empty the ashes, they're the people that cook the food, they're the nurses, the people that do the everyday task in our mental health hospitals. Recently we were up in Lincoln and they had 7 people feeding 70 developed mentally disabled people during the noon hour and it was a mess. They need more people in there. And I think this is...where you have a chance to determine where you want to place your priorities, whether you want to give college administrators a 4-1/2% raise when they're already getting 40 or 50,000 a year or give a state employee that's getting 500 or 600 dollars a month a 4% raise. And I think this is a chance where you can order your priorities. And I would urge a green vote."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, you'll note that I'm voting green."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Boyle,...the Chair."

Boyle: "You'll note that I'm voting green. Since I spoke last I have talked to what I consider responsible labor leaders in Illinois and not some of the nitwits that are running around in my district and they have advised me that they desire, that it is their wish to go after the whole hog, to try to get it, to



roll the dice and so I would urge us to reject it if this is their wish. I think that they're the ones who helped to set up these agreements, they understand the risks involved, I would urge you to vote aye and reject it."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we're seeing here in this discussion and debate today is how ludicrous it is for an executive officer to set up through fiat collective bargaining. You have three departments of the whole state government that are involved and we, as a Legislature, are attempting to treat all state employees the same. We were not party to that contract therefore we should not be held responsible for doing something that was an error in judgment on the part of the Chief Executive Officer. And I'm voting no for an opportunity to vote aye on this motion to adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Kelly to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I agree with many of the past speakers who discussed this matter and talked about their position particularly when Representative Jacobs brought up the point that we're not talking about collective bargaining as much as we are about the needs of our citizens in these mental institutions. Now the money that we're discussing and talking about here pertains to money that will go mostly for direct care to these patients. Now we know and those who that have been in the Assembly know that if we do not accept this Report that it'll come back out again. Well let's give this Conference an opportunity and Mr. Byers a chance to go in and see if there is any chance to get additional funds for the citizens that need the most help, that cannot care for themselves. And I vote yes very easily because I know that this measure will come back on the floor."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I would just encourage you to take the record and get on with the final phase of



this."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 79 aye votes; 83 no votes; and 1 voting present. And the Gentleman's motion is defeated. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, now I would like to..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten, do you rise to ask for a reversal of the Roll Call?"

Totten: "No, not unless I can get six more red votes on here."

Speaker Houlihan: "All right, proceed."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, now as a Member of the Conference Committee I would like to renew my motion which was a substitute motion, originally, to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3377."

Speaker Houlihan: "Is there discussion? Representative Totten moves to adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3377 and the voting is now open. All in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote no. This will require 89 votes to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3377 and on that question Representative Mudd to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise to a point of information. If we vote red and do not accept this Conference Report does this make it in the same status as other Bills that do not proceed? Does it go back to the Committee from where it came? Okay, thank you."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Mudd, I would presume that somebody would renew their motion not to accept if this was not approved and then we would request a Second Conference Committee, if the House would adopt that motion. Representative Telcser. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a few months ago when a contract was entered into by the Chicago Teacher's Union and the City Chicago Board of Education there was a lot of green



lights up there that their vote...would have been voting red in the same kind of contest. It seems odd that all of a sudden when a different ox is being gored that some people see things through different eyes. Well let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the principle's the same. The identical principle is involved here. Either a contract is valid or it isn't. If you believe in things that are right, that you freely enter into an agreement and that all the taxpayers will honor that agreement in representative government then we will vote no on this motion and let the Conference Committee come up and cut out other expenditures that may not be valid but at least live up to the commitment that was made, freely entered into by the employees and representatives of the people in the Department that negotiated this contract. It's sheer stupidity to have the Legislature negate a freely entered..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, Representative Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "I urge a negative vote so that in a sensible manner that the Legislature may address itself to a question that is truly perplexing to all of us but at least come up with a reasonable answer and not to hide behind a sham that somehow our candidate for governor is saying one thing and our Democratic leaders are doing another in this House."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me remind the Members of the House those of you 'afeered' of what may happen in the collective bargaining agreement, you don't know what may be happening in the Second Conference Committee Report. I happen to agree with everything that's in this Conference Committee Report but I think it's best for the people of the State of Illinois in my own mind at least that what we have is the best and what we may have in a Second Conference Committee could be worse on all fashions. Let me also point out to the Gentleman from McHenry, that the third party was not involved in that negotiation that go on in collective



bargaining and that the people of Illinois, the taxpayers of Illinois, who are represented by you and I in this General Assembly. What has happened is that a contract has been entered into between two parties and almost eleven million people in this state have been left out and I think that's a sham. I think it's blackmail. I think the course we're taking to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 and it is the best one for the people of the State of Illinois and I urge a green vote."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think this vote is one of those if you stop beating your wife kind of things. If you're voting green you are allowing the contract raise for six months, as I understand it, with the understanding they're going to come in here for a deficiency. Apparently if you're voting red you don't believe in the raise in the first place. I'm sure there's some confusion around here and possibly I'm one of those confused. That's the way it's been explained on this floor."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Epton to explain his vote."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's been a rare occasion when I've gotten to debate or disagreement with Tom Hanahan and I do so reluctantly now. No one questions his sincerity, his desire, his zeal and his devotion to labor. By the same token I, too, have a dedication to labor but I am also confused by some of the remarks that have been made concerning what my duty is as a Legislator. My job is to determine how funds are utilized. When Tommy Hanahan suggests that because the Governor made an edict and allowed certain contracts to be entered into that I'm bound by that, his reasoning goes a bit beyond me. I perhaps would be very willing to see collective bargaining but if the issue of collective bargaining is decided it will be decided by this House of Representatives and not by the Governor and not by the labor unions. I say in..."



Speaker Houlihan: "Will you bring your remarks to a close?"

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will. I am very unhappy that voting...finding myself in this position but I do think this is the first opportunity I have had as a Member of this House to show the Governor that unfortunately, or fortunately, we still determine how our money will be utilized, And I necessarily must vote green."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this motion to adopt the First Conference Committee Report, 3377, there are 84 ayes; 78 nos; and 5 voting present. And Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, could I have a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Poll of the absentees. Deuster. Representative Totten, we'll have to wait until the machine gives us the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Brandt, Campbell, Capuzi, Craig, Deuster, Fleck, Hirschfeld, Huff, McGrew, McPartlin, and that's it."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I believe I'm recorded as not voting; I pushed a little late, would you please record me as voting aye?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Record Representative Deuster as voting aye.

On this question, Mr. Clerk. There are 85 ayes; 78 nos; and 5 voting present. Representative Duff."

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

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff is recorded as aye. That's 86 ayes and on this motion to adopt the First Conference Committee Report...Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Vote me aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Vote Representative Fleck, aye. On this question there are 87 ayes and the motion fails. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, I wanted recognition before and I wondered whether we could put a Conference Committee Report on postponed consideration and if we can I'd like to."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative, I don't believe that request was timely. Representative Walsh."



Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, that was a perfectly reasonable and timely request..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Walsh, it was certainly very reasonable."

Walsh: "And timely, Mr. Speaker, this should be put on postponed consideration that is what has been done and should be done."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I'm not mistaken it's Representative Byers who's the Sponsor of this Bill. I think it would be quite extraordinary for someone other than the Sponsor to be able to put the Bill on postponed consideration."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Lundy, this motion was put by Representative Totten. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been here a while and I...not quite as long as the Assistant Minority Leader, but I've yet to see the time when a motion to adopt a Conference Committee Report failed that that's not automatically followed with a motion not to adopt and it's always been a void vote too because you're going to waste a lot more time by putting...if you even had the right to put it on postponed consideration than by creating a Second Conference Committee and coming back here."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in the first place, the motion considering the action by the Senate was a..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff, Representative Schraeder, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I though I heard you declare that that motion lost and therefore he's out of order."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Schraeder, your point is well taken. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know that Representative Schraeder even knows what I'm going to say but he may be prescient."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff, he was making a point of order on the procedures of the House not on what you were saying."



Proceed, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "My point, Sir, is that considering the action of the Senate on this Conference Committee Report this is final passage and the House rules allow the maker of a motion or a Bill Sponsor on final passage to ask for postponed consideration. Now, Sir, Representative Totten as you have just said was the maker of the motion; furthermore, Sir, he did have his light on. He was seeking your recognition. You saw him and for whatever reason, perhaps you forgot he was the maker of the motion, you did not acknowledge him. Precedent in this House would allow Representative Totten to put his motion on postponed consideration."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this motion clearly lost, you announced it, so I urge you...request you appoint another Second Conference Committee."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers has moved for a...  
Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is quite a lot of confusion on this. Is there a possibility of dumping this Roll Call and taking a new Roll? I think he gave it..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madison."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madison on a point of order. On a point of order, Mr. Laurino."

Madison: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't know where Representative Duff read that in the rules and maybe he can tell me where postponed consideration extends to a motion."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff if you'll hold on just for a minute. Representative Laurino to continue his point."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the announcement of the Roll Call was quite abrupt and I believe that there were other people that were trying to be recognized to get on the Roll Call when you announced it. I would ask that it be...this Roll Call be dumped and a new one be taken."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijeovich."



Matijeovich: "I want to make the point that as to his point that that is not timely. As to Representative Totten's request to put it on postponed consideration, the rule relative to postponed consideration under 35-B, I believe, is only on Third Reading. It doesn't say anything about passage stage, it says Third Reading. There's nowhere where you can tell me under our rules where a matter on Conference Committee Reports can be put on postponed consideration. We don't have joint rules relative to that Representative Totten and as long as we don't you can't do it. So, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the only thing you can do now is to honor the request or motion by Representative Byers for the motion 'do not adopt' again."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Madison can be forgiven for his ignorance. When he's been around a little longer and recalls previous years he may recall that there are....in this..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff, will you refrain from personalities and make your point."

Duff: "Representative Madison used my name in debate, Sir. And Representative Matijeovich..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative...Representative Barnes, for a point of order."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, let me finish my point please."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Barnes on a point of order."

Barnes: "Well, it would seem to me, and I haven't been around here too long myself, but it seems to me that someone that has been around a little while that would or should know the kind of courtesy extended each Member here. And someone that I understand is going on to a higher branch of government....more..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Will you amend that to a lower branch, Representative?"

Barnes: "...Should more especially know that the manner in which to address a fellow Member is not in that vein."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you but I do not consider any branch of government higher than this one. Different perhaps."



Speaker Houlihan: "Your point is well taken."

Duff: "Now let me finish my point please, Mr. Speaker. Everybody's interrupting me for points of order, let me finish mine, if I may. Now Representative Matijevich knows that there is precedent for these motions being put on postponed consideration. If you will recall a vote on the Governor's veto which is not Third Reading was put on postponed consideration in prior years. If you will recall in the closing hours of the 78th General Assembly such a motion was put on postponed consideration. I would further point out to the Parliamentarian and the Gentleman in this House that when House Bills don't pertain, as was so ably pointed out by Representative Matijevich, precedent and Roberts Rules pertained. There is no reason in the world, Sir, that Representative Totten's motion should not be accepted. And I will say further that I up until this last Roll Call have been supporting the position of the people on the other side of the aisle on their first nonconference and if they don't let Representative Totten have his fair day in court they're going to lose my support and I hope many others."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ewell on a point of order."

Ewell: "My point of order is very simple. We have now voted on whether we should concur with this Conference Committee Report and it's obvious we don't have the requisite number of votes. Prior to that we got ourselves in a...may I finish please? Prior to that time we got ourselves into the predicament because the Chair insisted on letting the Sponsor do it the way he wanted to do it. We then voted that we...on that particular motion when it was voted that we nonconcur, we have already voted that we...we already voted on the nonconcurrence and the number of Members voting to the contrary were the larger. So I ask you now how can we possibly go back and reconsider his motion which would be to nonconcur which is the necessary step before you can appoint a Conference Committee."

Speaker Houlihan: "If the House would stand at ease and I will consult the Parliamentarian. And during that time I'd like to introduce



Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Kucharski has moved for reconsideration and Mr. Schraeder has raised a point of order as to the propriety of that motion. Is the rule on Mr. Schraeder's point?"

Speaker Houlihan: "On that point, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as soon as you determine that ruling I'd like to be recognized."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Kucharski, Representative Byers had moved to not adopt and I believe we should take that order of business first. And on that motion, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. I'd like to make either one or two motions. One either a substitute motion again which you ruled had preference. Or secondly that Representative Byer's motion lie upon the table."

Speaker Houlihan: "Members of the General Assembly, Representative Byers has moved that we not adopt the First Conference Committee Report. Representative Totten has moved that that motion lie upon the table. And on that, all those in favor say aye; and all opposed say no. On that question it appears we need a Roll Call. On this motion is Representative Totten's motion to table Representative Byers' request that we nonconcur with House Bill 3377 and ask for a Second Conference Committee. On that motion... Representative Kane on a point of order."

Kane: "Since Mr. Byers' motion is identical to the motion that he made several minutes ago and it lost, does it not require somebody who voted on the prevailing side to move to reconsider the motion rather than a simple renewal of the motion?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The Parliamentarian has advised me that this is a renewable motion and Representative Byers has renewed his motion after some action has been taken."

Kane: "On the same point then is Mr. Totten's motion a renewable motion?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Yes, Representative Totten's motion is. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, you never gave me a ruling that I asked for when I



a former Member of the House, Representative Lemke. The former Representative Lemke, Senator Lemke. Leroy, that was better than last time. The Chair has ruled that this motion has failed. Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be recorded as no since it will not change the outcome of this..."

Speaker Houlihan: "There has been objection. Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative. Representative Boyle, for what purpose did you erupt?"

Boyle: "All right. Mr. Speaker, I think that Representative Byers has made a motion. I think that motion is very clear even to the Chair and I'd ask you to vote on it. I don't what...we've been on this thing now for an hour and I'd urge the Membership to get on with the business, let us appoint another Conference Committee and try to work out the differences that we have. Now let's get a Roll Call vote on Representative Byer's motion 'do not adopt'.

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Kucharski, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kucharski: "For a motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "State your motion."

Kucharski: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which this motion lost."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, that motion is out of order. Representative Byers has a motion to ask for a Conference Committee and I think his motion takes precedent and I think we ought to send it back so we can have some action on this Bill."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Laurino, for what purpose do you rise?"

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, that motion by Representative Byers is not correct. I renew my request for a new Roll Call, dump this Roll Call and take a new Roll Call and you'll probably eliminate 95% of your problems right now."



reminded you that this House put the Governor's veto on Aid to Education on postponed consideration last year on a motion of Representative Daniels. That was a precedent, Sir. It was pointed out that the rules don't apply...no, it wasn't Daniels, excuse me, it was pointed out by Representative Matijevich that the House rules don't apply. When House rules don't apply precedent does. And you, Sir, didn't give us a ruling and I've given you precedent."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Duff, you made a point and a very good point and the Speaker took that under consideration as he considered this matter and you did not ask for a ruling on that point. I merely took that into the equation to get us to where we are now. And if we return to that we will get to that ruling. Now on this question all those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote no. Mr. Clerk, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 85 ayes; 55 nos; and 1 voting present. And the motion to table prevails. Now Representative Kucharski. Record Representative Mann as no. Representative Kucharski."

Kurcharski: "I renew my motion to reconsider the vote by which this motion lost."

Speaker Houlihan; "On the motion, Representative Kucharski, has moved to reconsider the vote by which Representative Totten's motion on House Bill 3377 lost and Representative Byers on that motion."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I move that that motion lie upon the table."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Byers has moved that Representative Kucharski's motion lie on the table. And on that question all those in favor vote aye and all opposed vote no. Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Parliamentary inquiry. I think the Members ought to really start thinking about this. It seems to me that there were motions made to not adopt the report. This is the second attempt being made to adopt the report. Now if this motion to table prevails we have a First Conference Committee Report that is sitting here going nowhere. It hasn't been adopted and has not



been adopted. It's in Limbo."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Fleck if this motion to table is adopted that will in effect kill the First Conference Committee. All those in favor vote aye; all those opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Hanahan, to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "No, Mr. Speaker, not to explain my vote but as long as people like to take the time in foolish methods of trying to slow things down might as well start right now and I respectfully request a poll of the absentees and a verification. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out we intend to slow it down past midnight."

Speaker Houlihan: "That is not very good news to all of the Members."

Hanahan: "If we can't have a Second Conference Committee Report on this that's the only method to protect the minority in this House. Chicago isn't going to run us over today."

Speaker Houlihan: "I understand that. Representative Riccolo requests to be recorded as aye. Representative Barnes wishes to be recorded as aye; Representative Jane Barnes. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees has indicated by his remarks that he's going to be dilatory. And I wondered whether you would rule such and rule him out of order."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Clerk will call the Roll of the Absentees. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, we're wasting time here and I think the...your ruling should have been this. When the motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report failed then you should say it goes to a Second Conference Committee automatically. That's always been the rule here. If a motion to concur fails it's automatically nonconcurrency. Motion to adopt fails it's automatically goes to a Second Conference Committee. And you should just rule that from the Chair and let's go ahead. Send it to the Second Conference Committee."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to echo what my colleague from



Lake County said because really if you don't do that what you're going to do on any matter where you don't have 89 ...if you don't have the majority to not adopt you tie everything up. So that has always been the case where the motion to adopt does not carry. It's been automatic. The Chair...in many instances hasn't even, in fact we did it today where the Chair didn't even call for a voice vote and that's the way we proceeded. And it's the only way you can operate and I plead with you Mr. Speaker, just from the podium say that a Second Conference Committee shall be convened and appointed."

Speaker Houlihan: "On that point, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to remind you that this very same point came up when this year's Session started with Representative Kozubowski's Bill. Speaker Redmond ruled that if a motion to concur failed, or a motion to adopt a Conference Committee and the reverse motion isn't put or failed the Bill or the matter stays on the calendar and it does not automatically go to a Conference Committee. Now I happen to have felt the way Representative Matijevec and Representative Pierce feel but Speaker Redmond ruled otherwise. And that happens to be the rule right now. And your Parliamentarian knows so."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Telcser, I'll consult with the Parliamentarian. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Gene Barnes, Brandt, Brummet..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "How many votes does it take for this motion to win?"

Speaker Houlihan: "A simple majority."

Geo-Karis: "Well, it seems to me we've been horsing around for two hours for nothing. Why don't we get down to brass tacks and try to finish up this Session honorably. The Senate is wasting the taxpayer's time. For heaven's sakes let's send it back to a Second Conference so they may be bound by it."



JUN 30 1976

190.

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Clerk Selcke: "Campbell, Capuzi, Choate, Craig, Deuster, Duff, Epton, Friedland, Gaines, Grotberg, Hirschfeld, Ron Hoffman, LaFleur, Macdonald, Mann, Marovitz, McAvoy, McGrew, McPartlin, Merlo, Palmer, Porter, Reed, Rose, Schisler, Sevcik, Tuerk, Vitek, Wall, Washburn, Younge, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Negative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. The count at this time is 63 ayes and 79 nays. Representative Palmer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Palmer: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Palmer: "Vote me aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record him as aye. Representative Reed."

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

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Lady is recorded as being absent."

Reed: "Vote me aye, please."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Lady as being aye. Representative Von Boeckman wishes to vote no. I'm sorry, Representative Grotberg wishes to vote no. Grotberg. Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as voting aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Mann, aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Deuster. Representative Deuster, is no. Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as voting aye."

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as voting aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record Representative Schisler as voting aye. Proceed with the verification of the Negative Roll Call."



Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, because of the proximity of where I sit and have requested the verification, I find it necessary to suspend the provisions of the rule of not being in my seat during the verification in order to verify the Roll Call. Do I have leave to...if anyone objects we'll have a Roll Call on that and you know I could ask for the verification of that also, but I'd like to suspend the provisions of the necessary rules that I may leave my seat to verify the Roll Call so I have visual ability to verify those Members in this General Assembly."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, proceed with all haste. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "How am I recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Gaines: "Please vote me aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record him as voting aye. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I was trying to be recognized and you didn't recognize me. What Representative Hanahan asked for is the suspension of the rules because I was going to object to that but you didn't give me...accord me that privilege and I object now. He can only do that by suspending the rules. We don't grant that to everybody...anybody else, Representative Hanahan, you know that. You ought to be ashamed of yourself. You ought to stand there. You chose that seat, I didn't give it to you. You took that seat, if you are there out in left field that's where you want to be, you can go to rest, nobody will notice it. But now you want to be roaming all over the aisles here and I don't...object to that, Tom."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Brummet wishes to be recorded as aye. Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "A point of order."

Speaker Houlihan: "State your point."

Friedrich: "Representative Hanahan has by his own admission said he's going to use every tatic he can to slow down this House. Now



that is on its face dilatory. The rules provide you cannot be dilatory and Representative Hanahan has already confessed that he intends to be dilatory."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative Ebbesen, Representative Hanahan, underneath the light."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, there are also other rules we honor around here one is mentioning a Gentleman by his name in debate and I feel very strongly that the previous speaker wants to admonish somebody around here better read the rule book himself and quit using Gentlemen's names or Lady's names in debate."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I, too, sit in the back of the Chambers and did select this seat and I cannot see the clock. Can you tell me what time it is?"

Speaker Houlihan: "At this time it's 20 minutes after 5. Representative Kosinski corrects me, it's 24 minutes after 5. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Please vote me no, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record Representative Duff as no. Representative Hart."

Hart: "I've got more important business to attend to. Can I be verified at this time?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Representative Hanahan, Members."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if anyone that would be, you know, voting opposite my viewpoint and requests me, as a Gentleman to another Gentleman, I agree that if that somebody has legislative business of utmost importance that he does not have to be here. Yes, I will verify now. Representative Totten requested the same thing and I'll verify Representative Totten also. And a woman also, I'm very bisexual on that."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Macdonald."

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



Speaker Houlihan: "How is the woman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Lady is recorded as being absent."

Macdonald: "Vote me no."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the woman's, the Lady, excuse me, Representative Macdonald. I apologize. Record the Lady as voting no. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, point of order. Two of the Members have raised the point of order that the Gentleman's actions are being dilatory and the Chair has not ruled. I think the Gentlemen, both of whom raised the point, are entitled to a ruling."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman has a right to a verification. Will you proceed with the verification? Let me point out for the Members of the House that we have taken two votes on this and the House has decided to go neither way. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Because of the objection of Representative Matijevec, and there is a rule specified in the House Rules, that a Member must be under decorum, in his seat, I now move to suspend that rule so that I may leave my seat in order to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you're going to take a Roll Call on that I suggest it be a oral Roll Call or else the vote of the board will be dumped and then there'll be complete confusion."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijevec on a point of order."

Matijevec: "A point of order. Is that motion reduced to writing? I don't know if that's reduced to writing yet and I think that under the rules that any motion where a Member asks for it to be written in motion if..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, are you requesting a motion to leave your seat. Will you please remain in your seat?"

Matijevec: "And I understand that Representative Hanahan is busily writing and I'm not sure what he's writing about but if he's writing a motion that's all right. But if he's writing a letter



to the Clerk then that's bad. And I make the point of order that that motion should be in writing...could you rule on that point?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijevec, could you restate you point?"

Matijevec: "In full?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Well, no, try to..."

Matijevec: "I thought that motion by Representative Hanahan under our rules ought to be in writing. And I wanted to check with the Speaker if it is in writing."

Speaker Houlihan: "I believe that motion is in writing. Mr. Clerk."

Matijevec: "All right. I apologize."

Speaker Houlihan: "Proceed with the verification."

Clerk Selcke: "Arnell, Beatty, Bluthardt, B. Bradley, Jerry Bradley,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hanahan: "On a point of order. Has my motion been acted upon?"

I believe it takes precedence in order for me to have the opportunity to verify I need the motion to receive a majority vote to suspend the rules. I don't know if I need 89. Maybe the Parliamentarian would explain whether or not I need 89 votes to suspend the appropriate rule on decorum."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, there is another motion pending which has priority. I suggest you sneak around... Would the Clerk continue with the verification of the Negative Roll Call? Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Bluthardt, B. Bradley, G. Bradley, Capparelli, Carroll, Coffey, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, Davis, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Duff,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Will those Members remain in their seats and raise their hands as the Roll is called? Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "John Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Fleck, Friedrich, Garmisa, this is one on the board, Giglio, Grotberg, Hart, Gene Hoffman, Dan Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Emil Jones, Kane, Keller, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski..."



Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, will you verify Representative Simms?"

Simms: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Houlihan: "Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Randolph, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Houlihan: "Does the Gentleman have leave, Representative Hanahan, will you verify Representative Randolph?"

Hanahan: "How is he voting?"

Clerk Selcke: "Voting no."

Hanahan: "Okay, if you've got something to do."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Randolph is verified."

Clerk Selcke: "Lechowicz,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Porter, for what purpose do you rise?"

Porter: "How am I recorded, please?"

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Porter: "Please vote me no."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as voting no. Representative Lauer, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Lauer: "Change that to aye, please."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as voting aye. Proceed with the verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, McAuliffe, McCourt, McLendon, McMaster, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Nardulli, Neff, Patrick, Peters, Pierce, Porter, Pouncey, Randolph, Rigney, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Shea, Simms, Skinner, Stearney, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Totten, Waddell, Walsh, White, Williams, Yourell."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, do you have any questions



of the negative vote?"

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Brandt."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, if you can hold for a second I will give you the accurate count. Representative Hanahan and other Members of the House we are starting this Roll Call with 70 ayes and 83 nays. Representative Hanahan on a verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Hanahan: "I had a parliamentary inquiry I was asking recognition earlier..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Proceed with your parliamentary inquiry."

Hanahan: "All right. And that is that as long as the Affirmative Roll Call was not requested for verification, do they get a shot if I reduce 13 names off this Roll Call? Under what rule? I thought the rules specifically said that if they wanted they must request it timely and I just..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, their request would not be timely until you brought them under and therefore they would have the opportunity to verify the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed with the verification."

Hanahan: "Then they would have that."

Speaker Houlihan: "They have that opportunity. Proceed with that verification. On a point of order, Representative Laurino." Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "As long as Representative Hanahan is having trouble seeing the Membership would he like that I take the verification for him."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, Representative Laurino has volunteered to do the verification for you."

Hanahan: "He doesn't have 20-20 vision I understand and he wears glasses and I'd be fearful that he may overlook a few."

Laurino: "Well, Representative Hanahan can't see through wood."

Speaker Houlihan: "Proceed with the verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Bluthardt is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Bennett Bradley."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Bennett Bradley is in his seat."



JUN 30 1976

197.

Hanahan: "Representative Carroll."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Carroll. Is Representative Carroll  
in the Chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting no."

Speaker Houlihan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Representative Roscoe Cunningham."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Cunningham is just about in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Corneal Davis."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Davis is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Deavers. Gil Deavers."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Deavers. Is Representative Deavers  
in the Chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "No."

Speaker Houlihan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Representative Deuster from Lake County."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Deuster is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Domico is down here in the front."

Hanahan: "Not in his seat."

Speaker Houlihan: "He is in the Chambers and moving toward his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative John Dunn is in the back of the Chambers."

Hanahan: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Hanahan: "Representative Charlie Fleck. "

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Fleck. Representative Fleck. How  
is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "No."

Speaker Houlihan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Garmisa is standing right by his desk."

Hanahan: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Houlihan. Representative D. L.  
Houlihan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"



Clerk Selcke: "No."

Speaker Houlihan: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Emil Jones is in his seat next to his son."

Hanahan: "Representative Kempiners."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Emil Jones, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the Gentleman is acting dilatory, he's going down the list and he saw me sitting here. I waved at him, and so I believe his actions are dilatory and I wish you would actually deny him this verification."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Fleck has returned. Representative Emil Jones' point is well taken. Proceed with the Roll Call. Representative Brandt, for what purpose do you rise?"

Brandt: "...Recorded?"

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Absent."

Brandt: "Vote no."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as voting no. Representative Choate."

Choate: "Would you record me as aye, please?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as voting aye. Representative Hanahan would..."

Hanahan: "What was the last name and I'm not being dilatory, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Emil Jones. Would you...Representative Hanahan, would you verify Representative Bradley?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I have a list here of names...Yes, I will, Sir... Bradley requested earlier was the other Bradley, Bennett Bradley."

Speaker Houlihan: "Proceed with the verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Hanahan: "We were on Emil Jones. Representative Kempiners."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Kempiners is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Lechowicz. Representative Lechowicz is in the aisle."

Hanahan: "Representative Leon."



Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Leon is in the center aisle."

Hanahan: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Roger McAuliffe is sitting in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Ted Meyer."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Meyer. Representative Meyer, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "No."

Speaker Houlihan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Representative Dan Pierce."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Dan Pierce is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Rigney."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Rigney. Representative Rigney is standing behind the...he's in his seat."

Hanahan: "And Representative Stearney."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Ron Stearney is in the aisle."

Hanahan: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Bob Terzich is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Walsh, I see him right...I didn't see him before. Representative Williams."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Williams, how is the Gentleman... Gentleman's in the aisle."

Hanahan: "Representative Friedrich."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Friedrich. Representative Friedrich is over talking to Representative Brandt."

Hanahan: "And I have no other questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "There being no further questions, what is the Roll Call? There being 71 ayes and 80 nays, the Gentleman's motion to... Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, please record me as aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as aye. The Gentleman's motion to table fails and we are back to Representative Kucharski on his motion to reconsider. Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, point of order."



JUN 30 1976

200.

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan on a point of order."

Hanahan: "Is the motion reduced to writing?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative...Mr. Clerk, is the Representative's motion in writing? His motion not being in writing we will move to another order of business. Representative Duff you'd better hurry we're moving to another order of business. The Gentleman renews his motion and on this motion Representative Kucharski moves to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 3377 was adopted, failed to be adopted on the First Conference Committee Report. We'll have a Roll Call on this motion. All those in favor vote aye. All those opposed vote no. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the rules clearly say that the Clerk should read the motion. You know, so that we know. A written motion is the Clerk's responsibility to read it. ...Ruling if the Parliamentarian would like to read it."

Speaker Houlihan: "Mr. Clerk, would you like to read the motion?"

Clerk Selcke: "Having voted on the prevailing side I move to reconsider the vote by which Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 3377 lost. Ed Kucharski."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker, the Clerk read that but who's name was on it?"

Clerk Selcke: "Edmund undecipherable middle initial Kucharski."

Jacobs: "Well I thought I saw Representative Dunn take it up there. Or Duff."

Speaker Houlihan: "Mr. Clerk, will you take the Roll Call. All those in favor vote aye; all opposed vote no. Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, not being able to follow all the convolutions that we've gone through here in the last couple of hours, would you please clarify for me if we are in favor a Second Conference Committee being appointed. Do we vote aye or no?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Those Members in favor of appointing a Second Conference Committee ought to be voting no. Those Members in favor of a First Conference Committee Report should vote aye. Have all voted who wish? Representative Matijevich."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, one other day of the Session the Parliamentarian under Roberts Rules and I think it may be on page 291 makes a point of order that a motion is out of order if it deals with practically the same question that has just been decided and I say that this...by your ruling that the other matter was declared that this was the same motion that has already been decided and therefore is out of order."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijevich, this is an order to reconsider and is in order. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry. How many votes are required for this motion?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Madigan, since his motion, initial motion had lost the motion to reconsider would require a simple majority of those voting. On that point, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Point of order. Any motion that takes 89 or more also takes 89 to reconsider. Now the Parliamentarian, I know, knows that one."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matijevich, the Parliamentarian advises me if we were reconsidering the vote by which the report was adopted it would require 89. But we are reconsidering the fact that this motion has failed and therefore it would only consider a simple majority of those voting. Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this motion there are 79 ayes, 61 nos and 2 voting present. Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hanahan: "I'd like to poll the absentees and verify the Roll Call.

It's not dilatory, I have a right under the rules. Anyone want to move to suspend them?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, you have the right to verify but now you have to poll the absentees."

Hanahan: "...Poll the absentees. So I move then, Mr. Speaker, to poll the absentees. Do I have to make a motion to do that or could I have leave to go through the list of the absentees?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The motion has apparently prevailed and the maker of the motion, Representative Kucharski, has the right to poll



absentees. Representative Kucharski. On this vote there are 79 ayes; 61 nos and 2 votes present. And Representative Hanahan has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call.

Proceed with the verification."

Clerk Selcke: "Arnell,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, switch my vote to aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record Representative Darrow as aye. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk Selcke: "Beatty, Bluthardt, B. Bradley, G. Bradley, Brandt, Capparelli, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, Darrow, Davis,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, some people may accuse me of being dilatory but at least I'll work within the rules. The rules clearly say that when a Member is called upon on a verification that he should stand or rise in order to be recognized so we do not have a dilatory practice of calling names of Members who are truly here and present. Now I first of all can't see a lot of people with all the walking around and all the unnecessary personnel that's on the floor during the verification. And secondly, Members names have been called in this verification that have not risen or raised their hand. Now if I have to call their names off and somebody says later it's dilatory because I called their name and they were sitting there. I think the rules clearly provide for the decorum of this House that the Member either raise their hand or show..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan, your point is very well taken but this is the fourth Roll Call on this Conference Committee and we are coming very close to a dilatory action. And I ask the Clerk to continue with the Roll and proceed with haste."

Clerk Selcke: "Deuster, DiPrima,..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would suggest by the words of the last speaker that his intentions were dilatory, said he would try to keep us here all night, and I would suggest that is dilatory and this verification should not be made."



Clerk Selcke: "Duff, Dyer, Ebbesen..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Kozubowski, I've ruled that that is not dilatory. Proceed with the Negative Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Epton, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Fleck, Friedrich, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Grotberg, Ron Hoffman, Hudson, Huff, Emil Jones, Kane, Kempiners..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker...record Representative Dan Houlihan as aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kornowicz..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you rise? Record the Gentleman as voting aye. Representative Macdonald, record the Lady as voting aye. Representative Lauer, record the Gentleman as voting no. Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, McAuliffe, McCourt, McLendon, McMaster, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Nardulli, Neff, Patrick, Peters, Pierce, Porter, Pouncy, Rigney, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Shea, Simms, Skinner, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Taylor, Telcser..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, please record me as voting aye."

Houlihan: "Representative Londrigan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Londrigan: "Would you please record me as no but if he doesn't stop his dilatory tactics he's going to lose me permanently."

Speaker Houlihan: "Your point is well taken. Representative Hanahan, did you hear Representative Londrigan? Representative Boyle, for what purpose do you rise?"

Boyle: "Well, I'll wait a little bit longer, Mr. Speaker, but it sure is taking us a long time to get back to that whole hog."

Clerk Selcke: "Schuneman, Shea, Simms, Skinner, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, Waddell, Walsh, White, Younge, Yourell."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Hanahan on a verification of the Roll Call. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you rise?"

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



Clerk Selcke: "Absent."

Winchester: "Vote me no, please."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as voting no. Representative Matijeovich, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Clerk Selcke: "Absent."

Matijeovich: "Vote me no."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as voting no. On this vote there are 84 ayes and 63 nays. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "The count right now is what?"

Speaker Houlihan: "84 aye and 63 nays."

Hanahan: "Okay, Mr. Speaker. Deuster. He's not in his seat."

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Gentleman recorded? He's right there in the aisle."

Hanahan: "Representative Cunningham."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Cunningham? Where? He's up in the gallery."

Hanahan: "Oh, he's not in his seat. Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative John Dunn is in the aisle."

Hanahan: "Not in his seat."

Clerk Selcke: "He's recorded as being present."

Hanahan: "Representative...I see him back there. Representative Meyer."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Meyer is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Mahar. He's in the aisle."

Hanahan: "Representative Rigney."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Rigney is in his seat."

Hanahan: "Representative Simms."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Simms. Representative Simms, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Houlihan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Representative Schuneman."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Schuneman is in his seat."



Hanahan: "I didn't see him before. Representative..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Simms has returned to the Chambers, return him to the Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Representative Wall, no, excuse me, he's on the right side. Representative Williams."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Williams is by his seat."

Hanahan: "I have no other questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Having no other questions, final Roll Call is... Representative Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mann: "Please record me as voting no."

Speaker Houlihan: "You're recorded as aye, Representative Leverenz. Representative Mudd, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mudd: "Would you please record me as no, please?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Record Representative Mudd as no."

Clerk Selcke: "Who's that?"

Speaker Houlihan: "Mudd. On this motion there are 83 ayes and 65 nays and the Gentleman's motion carries. And the vote by which the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3377 lost is now reconsidered and is now before the House. Representative Totten, do you wish to renew your motion?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish to renew my motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3377."

Speaker Houlihan: "Is there discussion? Now Gentleman I have a bad announcement for all of you Members. I wish there would be some order in the House. I would wish to stay with you on this vote but I have an appointment at six o'clock and I'm going to have to leave the Chair. I appreciate your consideration. And I would ask someone to relieve me from the Chair because I have a very important... Representative Walsh, would you like to put your request to assume the Chair to a vote? All right."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, moves to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3377. And on that is there discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, so that every Member



knows what I was referring to earlier when we were talking about what this deal in effect is going to do if we concur, it's going to negate the Democratic candidate for governor's position as of Saturday, June 26, when in addressing the Illinois State Employee's Association he clearly said and I'll quote 'working men and women covered by collective bargaining agreements have the right to know their contract will be honored'. Howlett said..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hanahan. Mr. Hanahan. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, arise?"

Totten: "For a point of order, Mr. Speaker. What Mr. Howlett's position is on this Bill is not up for discussion right here. What is our position on this Bill is up for discussion. I wish the Gentleman would confine his remarks to the merits of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hanahan, we're discussing the Conference Committee Report and under the rules please confine your remarks to that report, Sir."

Hanahan: "Yes, Sir, your request will be honored and in coming to the conclusion of why I am speaking on this issue is because many people enter into my frame of mind and into my heart on why I stand for or against various pieces of legislation. But particularly so on this piece of this legislation, not only positions of other Legislators or expediency but the position of our candidates for Governor, Michael Howlett, comes to my mind on why I take a position in opposition of adopting this Conference Committee Report. I might go on to say what he said that influenced me so well in the area of collective bargaining when he said that if this collective bargaining program of the present Governor he said 'as Governor until appropriate legislation is passed I will continue the Executive Order..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hanahan...."

Hanahan: "...That has brought about this problem that we're discussing now."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Hanahan. Mr. Hanahan. Before I have to, you know,..."



Hanahan: "I'm almost through with it, I mean you..."

Speaker Shea: "Just confine your remarks to the Bill."

Hanahan: "Yes, I am. I'm explaining, Mr. Speaker, if you listened that the reason why I am opposed to this Conference Committee Report is not only because of Michael Howlett and his position but because of William Lee, the President of the Chicago Federation of Labor and because of Stanley Johnson, the President of the AFL-CIO, and because of Robert Johnson of the UAW. And because of every well-thinking union man and union woman in this state that does not like to have a collective bargaining agreement negated by a motion such as this that we're voting on. It's pure and simple fact that this is a labor issue, this is a labor vote and if you have any doubts about it read how you vote later on it. The facts remain..."

Speaker Shea: "Would you confine your remarks to the Bill, Sir."

Hanahan: "I am confining them completely. The fact of the matter is that the vote on this Bill, the vote on this motion, definitely mandates how you think about collective bargaining and its process in Illinois. It also makes...brings to mind a few points. In the past this General Assembly has addressed itself to other problems concerning collective bargaining and agreements that have been entered into such as the Chicago Teacher's Contract which this General Assembly's override motion and the rest. Now if those contracts caused as much concern to the Chicago Democrats that have voted opposite to my position on this issue I'm sure that...we wouldn't be in worrying about the Conference Committee Report #1, we'd already be addressing ourselves to Conference Committee #2. The facts remain that Conference Committee #1 Report negates a legal binding collective bargaining agreement. And I might point this out to the Gentleman from Cook and astute lawyer that under this present statute of Illinois under the Personnel Code Statute adopted in 1959 that Section 9.8 clearly mandates the Director of Personnel to negotiate wages, hours and conditions. Now that law has been on the books



JUN 30 1916

a long time and that is part of their province. Forget about the Executive Order, that's the Department of Personnel's responsibility. I might point out, so it isn't something new, it's something very sacred to the hearts of men and women who work for a living and serve us as public servants various categories around the state. If we adopt this Conference Committee we have said to those employees that our word and the word of their employers, Representatives, are no good. And it's pure and simple fact that the word of the Department of Personnel, the word of the Office of Collective Bargaining, should be upheld by this legislature. And we should not adopt this Conference Committee Report because if that happens, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, you're going to cause the greatest chaos, you might as well order a lot of tennis shoes for a lot of people in those prisons and a lot of people that work in this state because you're going to open the doors to a lot of chaos in this state if you adopt this Conference Committee. And I might point out if you think these are idle words look around the country and see what is happened when legislative bodies have turned their backs on working men and womens needs and rights. So I plead with you in behalf of those people who aren't elected; in behalf of those people who work for us. Don't turn your back on them, don't turn your back on them now by adopting a Conference Committee Report #1 when we have the opportunity, easy opportunity, to go back to the bargaining table; address ourselves to the real problems that beset this Legislature and adopt a true conference committee report that will not negate a contract that we freely entered into represented by law under the Department of Personnel's Code that we honor and took an oath to uphold. I ask for a negative vote."

Speaker Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill has been debated long enough, we've spent 2-1/2 hours on; I move the previous question."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put. All



JUN 30 1976

209.

those in favor will say aye. Those opposed will say nay.

In the opinion of the Chair the motion carries and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to close. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know whether you received that report of intimidation from the Gentleman from McHenry as I did but of course it's the same blackmail that's being put upon this Legislature when we face these collective bargaining agreements that we're facing not only in this Bill but in two others that will be before us. But in addressing myself specifically to this Conference Committee Report, I want to point out to the Members of the General Assembly that the estimated expenditures for the fiscal year that will end tonight for the Department of Mental Health are \$370,000,000. What Conference Committee Report #1 has in it is a bottom line figure of \$389,929,000. That's a \$19,000,000 increase over the last fiscal year. There is also a \$6,000,000 transferability in our operations line item. And this Department of Mental Health can certainly operate within those dollar figures and the increase that they have in this budget as it is in Conference Committee #1 is certainly enough. And I move for a favorable vote on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to explain his vote."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, as stated by Representative Laurino, the Bill has been thoroughly debated and there have been arguments on both sides of the issue but to my mind the issue, and it is a threshold issue, is our concept of representative government. My concept has always been that representative government is a partnership between the Executive and the Legislative. However for that partnership to work well cooperatively we cannot have the Executive through its subordinates negotiating contracts which in effect call upon us to appropriate money when we



JUN 30 1976

210.

were not a party to the negotiations. Not one of us, not one Member of the Appropriations Committee was a party to any of these negotiations. If you're concerned about labor and there are men in the gallery who are concerned about labor I refer you back...."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Madigan: "In direct reference to previous remarks, I'm from Chicago and if it weren't for Chicago those Bills wouldn't have passed."



Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll try to make this brief.

I was one of the many Legislators down here who was approached by many busloads of state employees from the Department of Mental Health the other day and I'm going on the record for this because undoubtedly this will be mentioned to them, probably printed to them, and probably hand delivered to them. I was threatened, I was threatened and told that my position as a Legislator would be jeopardized. But I'd have to say that the Gentleman from McHenry has sufficiently stirred me to stand up and do the right thing. I'm damned sick and tired of being threatened by the labor union and as far as I'm concerned his labor unions can go to hell. I'm going to change my vote on this and I don't want to be told any longer what the labor unions are going to do and the chaos they're going to create. If we can't stand up and make our country back like it was about a hundred years ago and get rid of these labor unions and all of these lackeys sitting upstairs then we have no business being down here. And I'm changing my vote and Adeline you can report on me."



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

The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that those that are supporting this, if they objected to the Executive Order giving the state the power to negotiate with the Employee's Union they should have done it at that time rather than come now after the employees bargain in good faith with the State of Illinois. And it seems to me if we can't live up to our dedication and our oath that we will support the people of Illinois and these are state employees and they are people of the State of Illinois. We should turn these negotiations but if we're going to live up to our word we better get on those red lights. Now I haven't always supported labor although I come from labor. And I rarely support Representative Hanahan but I happen to think for once he's right. In fact he's twice right this week. And I think we ought to be right ourselves and turn this Conference Report down, get to the meat, let the Committee go back and bring out a compromise that's acceptable to the State of Illinois. This is a bad report and ought to..."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Schraeder: "We need to have faith with ourselves and with the state employees. I say the red lights are necessary."

Speaker Shea: "Now nobody has to shout 'Speaker' I've got the lights on and I will call on every Member and there are 24 Members that seek recognition. And they will each get their one minute to explain their vote. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to explain his vote. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs, to explain his vote."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to reiterate what I said earlier. Remember the thousands of patients who are in these mental hospitals and if you think about how much money has been appropriated to mental hospitals just kindly think we were the ones who appropriated the money. We voted the five year plan. That's where a lot of your increase in expenditures is coming and just take



a second and think of the patients that we're going to deny the proper care to. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although my name has been used in debate I'm going to support a no vote on this because this union is the one that does have it in its contract that they will have no strike, work stoppages or slow-downs. When I know that these people have to work to help the mentally handicapped and we have a facility right in Waukegan, Illinois, the Developmental Disability Center, I cannot help but feel as the Sponsor of the Bill, Mr. Hanahan, and I don't always agree with him. And you can report your own colleagues what you want to do, do what you wish, but we do need labor as well as business. And we do need their help in these mental institutions. It's the handicapped that's suffering that's why I'm voting no."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to explain his vote."

Washington: "Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker. I want to respond very briefly to the Assistant Majority Leader who on two occasions enunciated a rather strange conception of the separation of powers doctrine which is new to me. It is not within the purview of the Legislative Body to sit down and negotiate contracts with Executive employees. That is the prerogative of the Executive wing of government. Period. And I think it's a false issue and if it has swayed your vote in any way I think you should reject it. The Legislature is involved in terms of its ability to provide the funds or not and based on its desire to provide the funds or not. The only issue here is whether you want to provide those funds. It seems to me in light of a 'closeness' of the vote in the Committee; in light of the heated debate on this floor; it seems to me that prior negotiations would have avoided a lot of this trouble. I submit that the Speaker who was on the stand when this..."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."



JUN 30 1976

214.

Washington: "...Submit that the Speaker that who was on this stand when the issue became boiling should have done as we have done in the past and sent this Bill posthaste back to a conference committee. He didn't do it and we've been embroiled in this charade for the last hour and a half. I submit further that we haven't really gotten down to the issue. We haven't really touched it. It's a strange reason why Members on my side of the aisle under their Leadership would be fighting this kind of thing. One reason I'm a Democrat is because I thought Democrats always supported collective bargaining, organized labor. I thought we were born to do that. I'm a little bit amazed at our Leadership has not found fit to follow that tradition and I'm somewhat relatively suspicious as to why they're doing it. I know the answer. I think you know the answer. And in knowing that answer it seems to me we should think twice before following Leader..."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, throughout this two-hour debate there's just one Member that I can recall who even thought to mention what we're doing for the people that need care, the developmentally disabled and the mentally ill and that was Representative Jacobs who brought that point up and suggested, it seems to me, that we should get on with this. You know it seems to me that if we send this to another conference committee and it appears that that's a distinct possibility we may very well lose the gains that labor has gotten through the collective bargaining line item in this Appropriations Bill. You folks who are voting red on this may find that your vote is indeed anti-labor not pro-labor. I'm not fond at all of my vote because collective bargaining is in there but that's really apart from..."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Walsh: "The Executive Order is actually, should be done in concert with the Legislature and I'm sure that if Mike Howlett is elected governor that he will do it in concert and so will Jim Thompson, if



elected governor, work with the Legislature in this very important area. In the meantime labor has gotten something, those labor leaders up there, have gotten something for their people that they really aren't entitled to, Mr. Speaker, but in order to get going on this and to make sure that the services are provided for our developed mentally disabled and mentally ill we should pass this Bill and we should pass it right now."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think again we need to think about the priorities and about these people that are going to be receiving this money and the people that they're serving. They're serving people in our mental health hospitals and I think it's time that we take and set priorities. And as a member of the Visit and Examine State Institutions, I've been in over a dozen of these institutions and there's not a one of them that doesn't need more help to show...to help them in their hospitals and this contract that has been signed here is a legal and binding contract. And we're either going to do it now or we're going to do it next December. The Department has budgeted their money so that we could do it now rather than come back in December or January. So they have a legitimate right to this money and I think this should go back to Conference Committee and I would urge a no vote on this issue."

Speaker Shea: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his..."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to echo one of the earlier speakers that I'm a little bit confused by what is going on here..."

Speaker She: "I'm sorry, Mr. Dunn, I forgot to push the timing light."

Dunn: "I'll try to be as brief as you're trying to tell me to be. I recognize the power of Executive to negotiate. I also support strongly our hold on the purse strings and I think we must look beyond both of those items here and decide whether or not this Agency needs this money. And I think that after doing a lot of talking during all these motions that as a matter of fact this



Agency does need this money to appropriately carry out the functions and responsibilities of the Department of Mental Health in the institutions and I think we should lay aside the politics here, support this request for these funds and realize that this union did, in fact, present an amendment in the House Committee to tack on an additional six or seven million on top of this which was considered by the House Appropriations Committee and defeated. This Amendment will result, if these funds are appropriated, will result in a bottom line..."

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Dunn: "A bottom line that is within the Governor's target projection and I think it's a matter that we should support. So I vote green, pardon me, red."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 87 ayes; 69 nays. The Gentleman's motion fails and there's a Second Conference Committee. On the Order of Conference Committees appears Conference Committee 3392 and on that the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe. All right, poll the absentees then, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Eugene Barnes, Campbell, Capuzi, Carroll, Catania, Chapman, Craig, Dave Jones, Klosak, McPartlin, Rose, E. G. Steele, Von Boeckman."

Speaker Shea: "All right. The Gentleman's motion loses and there'll be a Second Conference Committee. On the Order of House Bills on Committee Reports is House Bill 3392 and on that the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm going to move not to adopt Conference Committee and to request a Second Conference Committee. Now let me say that this is unlike the last Bill. This does not represent any compromise at all. In this one the Senate refused to budge on everything. The Senate did not yield on any particular item. Not only did they take out



collective bargaining money but they took out money for Herrick House, The Braille School, The School for the Deaf, The Illinois Soldiers and Sailor's Children Home, The Illinois Veteran Home, the Hospital School and many, many other things. I have conferred with Representative Shea, Representative Madigan, Representative Ryan, Representative Boyle, Representative Lechowicz and no one has any objection to this being referred to a Second Conference Committee and I would so move."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves that the House do not adopt Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3392. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, arise?"

Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, point of order. There were six, seven, eight Members of the Conference Committee who signed this report including myself and you know I wonder if you could just pull this out of the record for a minute so we could find out where we are?"

Speaker Shea: "The Sponsor has moved to nonadopt or not to adopt. If you wish you may make an alternate motion to adopt and on that we'll take a Roll Call. If it doesn't receive 89 votes I will declare that the House nonadopt that and send it to a second conference committee. Is that your motion, Sir?"

Totten: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Shea: "All right. The Gentleman moves a substitute motion to adopt the Conference Committee on House Bill 3392 and on that question, the Majority Whip, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really have a question of the Chair. At this time it's 6 o'clock and we're going to go to another conference committee that hasn't been set, if we go after the hour of 12 o'clock, Sir, how many votes is it going to take to adopt a conference committee report?"

Speaker Shea: "Sir, as I read Rule 66-B and let me read it to the Members of the House, 68-B says a 'conference committee report shall be placed on the daily calendar under the heading Conference Committee Report. Prior to June 20th of an annual



Session the conference report must be listed on the calendar'. And then it goes on for three hours. Let me read you Section C. 'Any bill in a conference committee where the conference report has been filed but not acted upon by June 30th of the year in which the bill was introduced shall be tabled and may not be revived. Any bill in a conference committee which has not reported by June 30th of the year in which the bill was introduced may not report to the House and the bill shall be tabled and may not be revived'."

Bradley: "Okay, Sir, then if we don't have a conference committee, a second report back on the calendar on the desks of the Members by 9 o'clock, I assume, then, we're in the posture where those bills will be tabled. Is that correct?"

Speaker Shea: "That is correct, Sir."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "If Mr. Collins suggests a special session might then be in order. Mr. Byers wants to know if we get per diem at a special session. On the Gentleman's motion to adopt, on the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3392. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, point of inquiry. I don't mind threats, Mr. Speaker, but I think that interpretation of that ruling is improper. That anything at 9 o'clock means that everything is dead. First of all, that rule can be suspended with 107 Members."

Speaker Shea: "I didn't say it was dead. Some Member from the floor said it might be."

Matijevich: "I thought I heard you agree with him,"

Speaker Shea: "At 12 o'clock tonight when that clock hits 12, the way I read the rule unless the rule is suspended anything in Conference Committee is dead, Sir."

Matijevich: "Well, the rule can be suspended."

Speaker Shea: "Absolutely."

Matijevich: "...Say that."

Speaker Shea: "...By a 107 Members. Now back to the Gentleman's motion



JUN 30 1916

219.

from Cook, Mr. Totten. Is there discussion on the motion?

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to make one correction about the statement that's been made about this Conference Committee Report. I was one of the signees of that Report and I suggest all the Members of the House if they look right beside my name they will see that that Report was signed by me in dissent. I did not agree with the actions that were being taken but to insure that we would get on with the business of the House, I signed that Report. But I also signed just beside my name that was in dissent. So it was not 8-2 vote, it was a 7 to 3 vote. And I concur with the mover of the original motion not to adopt this Conference Committee Report because the same issue, the same issue, that was involved prior to this is involved in this Report."

Speaker Shea: "On the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten's motion, Mr. Duff, do you wish to speak to the motion, Sir?"

Duff: "No, Sir, I was trying to be...rise on another matter."

Speaker Shea: "All right, on the Gentleman's motion, the Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle, do you wish to speak to the motion, Sir?"

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons enunciated by Representative Barnes I urge a no vote on this. It ought to be in the same posture as the Mental Health, they all three should rise or fall together."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, do you wish to speak to the motion, Sir?"

McClain: "No, Sir, this is an inquiry please of the Chair."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose, Sir?"

McClain: "Sir, we've always permitted for as long as the last four years that I've been here the mover of the Bill to make the motion. Now if Representative Jaffe does not have enough votes for nonconcurrency motion then we've always honored substitute motion. Now I realize that in the past it is perfectly legal, it was in the rules to recognize that substitute motion, but in the past it's always been the tradition of the House and the Chair to honor the



mover of the Bill and not to honor the substitute motion. And I'd ask you to please honor that tradition."

Speaker Shea: "Sir, as I understand the rules of this House if somebody makes the substitute motion I'm obligated to call that unless somebody makes a motion to lay it on the table. Mr. Totten, for what purpose do you arise?"

Totten: "At the proper time I'd like to close on my motion."

Speaker Shea: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to close."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3392 asks us to concur in Senate Amendment #1 which added the Amendment requiring the 50% for the first half of the year expenditure. It deleted the section which provided for 2% transfer among the purchase of Child Care items, this was all agreed in Committee and rearranged some funds along various line items. Senate Amendment #2 is the one in question regarding the collective agreement. Of the \$336,595 at question in Amendment #2, \$275,000 is for the collective bargaining agreement and \$61,595 is for elimination of vacancies. Now I remind the Members of the General Assembly that this Department has a \$50,000,000 operational budget which gives them a transferability of \$1,000,000. The question is not necessarily the same as that which appeared in the Mental Health Budget because of that 1,000,000 transferability. They're asking for 275 for this collective bargaining agreement and they certainly have that flexibility to pay those people without the threats and blackmail that have come before the Members of the General Assembly and I would respectfully request an aye vote on the motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Report #1. All those in favor of Mr. Totten's motion will vote aye; those in favor of Mr. Jaffe's position will vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this there are 96...or 26 ayes; 96 nays and 2 Members voting present. The Gentleman's motion loses. Report Mr. Collins, aye. Mr. Jaffe now moves that the House do not accept the Conference



Committee Report and asks to reverse the last Roll Call. Is there objection? Hearing none, the House will not concur in the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3392. And Mr. Clerk, vote Van Duyne no on the last Roll Call and please send a message to the Senate. Mr. Richmond, are you ready on yours?"

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

This was taken out of the record due to some discussion concerning committee appointments and I think you had distributed to your desks a list of the appointees to the Second Conference Committee. We've already gone into the action taken by that Committee and I would request a favorable vote to accept the Report of the Second Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1621."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, moves to adopt Conference Committee Report #2 on House Bill 1621. On that question, is there debate? Mr. Collins, I have a feeling you might want to discuss this Bill. Turn Mr. Collins on, please."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, rather than discuss this Bill I'd like to discuss this motion and I raised this point of order some hours ago and have awaited a ruling on it. We have not been informed as to the disposition of this Report as yet. The Conference Committee that was reported, and I have copy of the message to the Senate before me..."

Speaker Shea: "I thought it was cleared up, Mr. Collins..."

Collins: "No, Sir..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Clerk..."

Collins: "If it was, nobody told me about it, or anyone else that I have talked to on this side of the aisle."

Speaker Shea: "Well, let me find out then. Take it out of the record again."



Speaker Shea: "On the order of Conference Committees appears a Conference Committee... the Second Conference Committee on House Bill 3417 and on that the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think we have one here we can dispose of in a very short time, a non-controversial, no problems and... this Bill... This is the annual appropriation to the Department of Water Resources, Second Conference Committee Report... I might say that all ten Members of the Conference Committee were in attendance on both the Conference Committees. Conference Committee Report #2 and I will tell you what the Amendments are here... it was recommended that the Senate does recede from Senate Amendment #2 and #8. Amendment #2, is the Amendment that removes 5% of transferability on the line items within the budget and the Senate did agree to recede from that... Amendment #8 was an Amendment that Senator Weaver had put on that added the total cost of the completion of all the projects by adding about... forty million dollars, I would say and although we agree with the concept, it really does not belong in the fiscal '77, appropriations without the CDB bonding authority. So, Senator Weaver did agree to remove that and the Senate has concurred in the recession of Amendments #2 and #8. The Conference Committee concurs in Amendment #1, which restores ten thousand dollars for the development of plans of specifications of flood control improvement in Kankakee, Bourbonnais, Soldier Creek in the vicinity of Kankakee and it also puts ten thousand dollars in the General Revenue Fund for installation of fencing at the... a facility in Havana, which was originally in the bond portion of it and we agree that it should be out of General Revenue Fund, so the motion



was to concur in Amendment #1... also to concur in Amendment #3, which pays a proportion share of the cost of continuing development of storm water control plan in Madison, St. Clair, Monroe and Madison's Counties, that's one hundred and two thousand dollars... General Revenue Fund. Amendment #4, deletes nine hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars from Capitol Development Bond to repair and reconstruct the dam at Batavia... it is not necessary that it be in there because the repair is currently being done by the Department and so we agree on that... that should be removed. Amendment #5 adds five hundred thousand dollars Capitol Development Bond money for constructing a dam in Dirksen Park, the City of Pekin for flood control. This I might add, is the total cost of that and it can all be done within fiscal year '77. Amendment #7 adds thirty-two thousand dollars to General Revenue Fund for the state's FY-77 membership dues of the Great Lake Basin Commission. I might add that we also participate in the Upper Miss and the Wabash Basin and so there is agreement there. Amendment #6, is the Amendment that removes the Middle Fork Reservoir from this appropriation... I suppose there'll be questions, at this time, Mr. Speaker I would move that we adopt the Conference Committee #2 on House Bill 3417."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Moves for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on 3417. Is there any discussion? Hearing none... For what purpose does the Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey arise?"

Coffey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I arise to reject the Conference Committee Report #2 would like to point out to this Body that, on Committee Report #1, it was 6 to 4, to leave the



223.

Middle Fork project in this Bill.... then in the wisdom of the House of Lords on the other side of the rotunda when the Second Conference Committee was designated... they took on to remove some of the 'yes' votes to support those projects so that they would have the votes to delete the Middle Fork project. In the process, I would like just to point out to you... that four Governors of the State of Illinois have endorsed that program, the General Assembly on several occasions has funded already money towards those projects for land acquisitions... Vermilion County citizens are holding the bag on this project because they have signed class A bonds... general obligation bonds, for land acquisitions which is a debt to the county of Vermilion and this money has been designated... or this land has been designated only for the Middle Fork project... Lake project, so these bonds will have to be paid off, the land will not be able to be used. The City of Danville passed a referendum to tax themselves 3.3 million to help pay for this project by referendum of 60 some percent majority and I think that we have an obligation to the citizens to the State of Illinois and the constituents in Vermilion County to look at that project... to look what the people have put forth as far as tax dollars and for the State of Illinois to send a few of their tax dollars back to their county. I think that the Members of this General Assembly and especially the Members on the other side of the rotunda, has an obligation to some of the down-state projects. The City of Chicago, which one of the Members in this Committee... said that he was for saving tax dollars was the reason for deleting this project and I reminded him that not only a few days ago... that the penalty to the Chicago Schools of the fifty-two



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUN 30 1976

224.

million dollars was deleted down to thirty-two million dollars and when that Bill came before the House, I supported to assist in making that penalty less for the City of Chicago... because of their problems that they had at that time. There has been projects in the down-state area.... down and upstate that I've supported along with my colleagues, Representative Campbell and Representative Craig, that we supported and benefited your constituency and we just ask now that you take a look at our constituency and their needs and that you do not concur with this House Report #2."

Speaker Shea: "Now, I'm going out a little bit of order here..

Mr. Collins, to rectify the information on the 1621, which is the Arts Council... Mr. Barnes was replaced by Mr. Berman, Mr. Berman was replaced by Mr. Domico because Mr. Berman felt that he should not serve on that... because of a reason.... a conflict that he thought could or might be apparent. Mr. Domico, then served... the Clerk's records indicate that and if you want an opportunity before I call it again, Mr. Domico is here and you can go over and discuss it with him. So, it is the ruling of the Chair that Mr. Domico is on that Committee... and we sent a corrected message to the Senate. Yeah, Mr. Collins..."

Collins: "I think that if you sent a corrected message to the Senate... it was after the Conference Committee met and took their action."

Speaker Shea: "The Clerk... are a little slow in getting the messages across but it had been prior to that time."

Collins: "Ah, come on... Mr. Speaker, don't string me along.."

Speaker Shea: "I wouldn't do that...."

Collins: "Yes you.... I suggest that maybe you would... nobody showed me any records to show any corrected message even when your assistant leader came down and talked to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

me two minutes ago... it was still... the situation was still, as I stated earlier on the floor, to you... to the acting Speaker before you and to him. Now, let's..."

Speaker Shea: "That's where I am, Mr. Collins, you should check with the Clerk. Thank you, Sir."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Shea: "I want to get back on the subject..."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, no this is improper procedure and you know it, this message went across to the Senate, naming a Conference Committee which met without authority now, let's stay within the rules, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Mr. Collins, you know that you can check with the Clerk. Now, back to 3417... back on 3417, the Gentleman... the Lady from Lake, Miss Reed to speak... Mr. Walsh, for what purpose do you arise?"

Walsh: "I a rose to be recognized, Mr. Speaker and so did Representative Madison, for heaven sakes, how can you just completely overlook Members who seek recognition? That's not proper and you know that it isn't."

Speaker Shea: "I'm recognizing people... Mr. Walsh, I'm recognizing people for debate on 3417, is that the purpose that you're arising?"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, that is not what was under debate at the time that I sought recognition and you know it... nor was it the thing that was...."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Walsh... Mr. Walsh, there is no debate I'm telling you what the Clerks records indicate."

Walsh: "I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that we check with the Senate President's office and the Secretary of the Senate office..."

Speaker Shea: "You're free to do that, Sir?"

Walsh: "To see what their records..."

Speaker Shea: "You're free to do that... now back to Miss



Reed... Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madison: "For clarification of your ruling, Mr. Speaker. Does your ruling mean that henceforth in the future, if a Member is appointed to a Conference Committee he can be summarily replaced without the courtesy of notifying him... that he has been replaced or even why he was replaced."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Madison... the Speaker of the House appoints Members to the Conference Committee and he appoints the Republican Members at the request of the Minority Leader."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about a common courtesy to let somebody know that they have been appointed and then dis-appointed."

Speaker Shea: "I'm sure, Mr. Madison... that they are informed... now, Miss Reed, on 3417... Miss Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have rarely spoken out on issues other than those that I felt very strongly about. Conference Committee Report #2, on House Bill 3417 and the motion to concur are truly consistent with this agency and its competent administration. The Division of Water Resources and its involvement with the water supply, control, use demands, make them an incredible asset to this State with the massive water and flooding problems that we face all over Illinois. A 'no' or 'present' vote or a move to non-concur on this Second Conference Committee Report is a sham... it is a blatant effort to reverse this General Assembly and the agreed Amendment in order to find a means to return the five and a half million dollars to the highly controversial Middle Fork Reservoir, it was in this Agency's budget. This House couldn't afford the Middle Fork, two weeks ago... the Senate could not afford it one week ago and two Conference



Committees can't afford it now and we still cannot, Mr. Chairman, afford Middle Fork Reservoir. I urge you to concur in Conference Committee Report #2 and put an end to this foolishness."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Maybe I ought to start out the same way that the last speaker did, saying I usually agree with her, but she is wrong in a couple of counts... one, a couple of weeks ago we did say by a majority of the vote that we could afford Middle Fork.... one of the Conference Committees, the First Conference Committee, did say that we could afford Middle Fork..."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose do you arise, Mr. Collins?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you recognized me earlier to give me some information on Senate Bill 1621...."

Speaker Shea: "That's all I did, Sir."

Collins: "Now, I want to give you some... there is no corrected notice in the Secretary of the Senate's office. We've just checked over there, now if you're going to throw the rule book out... be honest about it and say to hell with the rules... but don't try and waltz me around and everybody on this side of the aisle. You're wrong... admit it and try to figure out some way to correct your mistake without running roughshod over the rules."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich... to continue..."

Matijevich: "Moving right along... I might say that the First Conference Committee Report was in favor of Middle Fork and then one of the Members from the Senate was replaced and finally with the misinformation that if we don't... if we don't delete Middle Fork, the funding wouldn't be approved for the Division of Water



JUN 30 1976

228.

Resources which was the total fallacy... I put this much in the corollary as many of us do when we fight for things in our district. I think that if this were in all of our districts we would be fighting hard... it always appears to me that many of us on the floor of the House... because we're afraid of that environmental vote, will stand and be so emotional about it. The environmental vote means so much... until it affects our own districts and then it doesn't mean that much because we know what a project can mean to our district. I have heard some about flood control in the Conference Committee... a couple of Members were so minimizing the matter of recreation... recreation means a lot, it means a lot to the economy of a district... it means so much to an area and I don't know what the cost rationale benefits are... I hear about that but you know, I don't believe in figures... people can throw figures at me all the time and I don't believe in it. I know... you know the Lady who spoke before me... she has a Chain of Lakes in her area, if we follow the policy that the Department of Conservation... and everybody knows they had a policy but they wouldn't say it publicly, that they were for the Chain of Lakes to be committed to a school area... what would that do to the recreational benefits to her area? She would be here screaming on the floor of the House... to hell with the environmentalist... the hell with all of them... protect the recreational resources of my area because of what it means to the economy of my area... so, I've got to put my faith in those in the district who must have felt that they need... who voted for it... I hear many people on the floor of the House say, I'm going to be against the Bill unless it has the right of referendum but then at a time when people... with that



right of referendum vote for a particular project and then four Governors right down the line... say that they approve that project and then we here say no... because we're afraid of the environmentalist emotions. That's really what it is all about so I would urge, and I sat on that Conference Committee... I would urge that we vote 'no' on Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It always strikes me as rather ludicrous when the Speaker gets up and wants to attribute motives to the other Members of the General Assembly why they vote one way or another. I don't know why the Lady that spoke in favor of this is voting the way that she is voting... I take her word for it... just as I have always taken the Gentleman from Lake's word for the reason why he votes for something... just as I have always respected his interpretation of the rules and I for one, in these late hours, is getting just a little bit tired of all of us attributing motives to others to the way that they vote. Now, let me say this... the Sponsors and the proponents of the Middle Fork Reservoir have come to our district... come to Champaign County and said, 'this is going to favor your district', and yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, it will benefit the district. There is no doubt about that... if you want a motorboat and you want to waterski for a few years until the filtration gets so bad that the reservoir has to be redone... it will benefit the district, it will probably benefit me... it will probably benefit my children... but my grandchildren are going to have to build another reservoir... and who is going to pay for that? All right, it helps my district but I'm not supporting the Bill no matter what the Gentleman from



Lake says about our motives. The last time that I spoke on this Bill, they got up and said... well certainly you're opposed to this... it's not in your district but you're always carting home every dollar you can get for the University of Illinois. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I stand before you and I dare one Member of this House to go back to my voting record and find out where I have supported the University of Illinois less than 50% of the time of what they have asked for down here. If the University of Illinois is wrong... and they're wrong damn often, I might add... I have not stood up on this floor of the House and asked for a single dollar, so when I oppose this I am not opposing it for more money for the University of Illinois or anything else in my district. I'm opposing it because I think it is a very bad precedent... just like I think all the reservoirs in the State of Illinois are bad and let me tell the Gentleman from Lake, that I personally don't appreciate him pointing his finger at me or anyone else by name or otherwise, and saying that when we agreed to support this Conference Committee Report and oppose the Middle Fork, we're kowtowing to the environmentalists of the State of Illinois. I told you what I thought of some of the environmentalists a few weeks ago when I told you the story about the sheep in Montana. Some environmentalists are absolutely looney but just because they are environmentalists doesn't mean they're always wrong and I would say this to you, if we didn't have the environmental group pointing out what the Corps of Engineers is trying to do to the State of Illinois there would be nobody... nobody that would have alerted the General Assembly, the House and the Senate to exactly what's going on... where we do nothing but build dam after dam, we pledge dollar after dollar to more brick



and mortar and nothing for education and the many other demands of the State of Illinois. So don't tell me that I'm kowtowing to the environmentalists or that anyone else is, I'm voting this on the issue, I have opposed every reservoir in the State and there is two in my district... this is one that benefit me... there is another one in the district...there are others who would benefit this directly... I've opposed them all, I think they are very bad projects and I would say this to you, we don't have the money... the Senate has not one time voted for this Bill in this Session of the General Assembly and there is no sense in kidding ourselves any futher, we're down to the final hour of the Session...the sensible thing to do is to vote 'aye', vote for a concurrence on this and get rid of the thing for this year and if the Middle Fork can truly justify its existence, let them come back next year and try and do it again with a new General Assembly. But, don't turn down this concurrencereport because it's going to go back to the Senate again and they're going to give it another 'no' vote and here we come again. It's time to get rid of it... I sorry that some of the Sponsors are not here for reasons beyond their control but, I know that if they were here they would be arguing on the merits and not trying to impugn the motive of those of us who oppose the Middle Fork. I recommend an 'aye' vote for concurrence on Report #2, on House Bill 3417 and if you're opposed to me I respect your motive, I just hope that you'll vote 'aye' this time."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Yes, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I respect that last man's motives for what he just said, because he has opposed every



JUN 30 1976

232.

reservoir in the State including a few in my district. And, this one doesn't happen to be in my district but I would like to say this because... there are a couple of Representatives who aren't here tonight because of other things and one laying over in the hospital there sick who I promised that I would support this reservoir to the hilt and I will. And, surely it has been a highly controversial... this here reservoir has, but I tell you, I think the people of Vermilion County and the people of Danville know what they want in their own county and they voted overwhelmingly to tax themselves to help pay for this reservoir... and I think that we should put it back in. Also, we talk about what's the economics are going to be of this thing and I want to tell you this, they lost a multimillion dollar industry to that county because they didn't have water supply and if they can get the water supply and this reservoir is a reality, there is going to be more jobs and more people put back to work and taken off the welfare rolls over there, so that they can afford to pay taxes and so that we can meet our obligations in this State. Also, I am amazed that the Leadership dare to point from the other side of the rotunda... a Member to fill a vacancy when one Member drops off of the last Conference Committee, a Member who always comes in here for money for his University of Southern Illinois and he's always back for more when he has a reservoir in his district but yet... he comes out and opposes this here and he's the one that put the stamp on here and also another Member from your side of the aisle over there who also has come out and opposed this reservoir and I think that it's time that this is sent back for a Second Conference Committee Report... I mean for a Third, and that we do come out and give the people of Danville what they



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

rightfully deserve, what four Governors have promised and give it to them and get on with the project of Middle Fork and get on with the business of the House and move this State forward and find jobs for people."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to urge you to vote 'no' on the adoption of this Conference Committee Report. My remarks will be quite brief. Number one, it won't be anything that you haven't done before the House has already voted... that we're in favor of Middle Fork, number two, I want to tell you that water is one of the greatest natural resources and you never realize that until you don't have it available. Danville has convinced me that they need it... they're willing to put their own money in it and I think that's a good cause. But, the thing that I want to appeal to you on is this, and if someone wants to call my hand that I'm in violation of rules, they can do so. Chuck Campbell, is a friend of mine... and I doubt if there is a Member on this floor who, one time or another he hasn't helped... unfortunately for him he can't help himself tonight and out of respect to him and in deference to all the things that he has done for all of you, I would like to send this thing back one more time and reconvene this Conference Committee... just to give it one more shot, that's not going to hurt you... and I'll tell you what, it will be a shot in the arm for Chuck Campbell. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I have a Parliamentary Inquiry... we are considering a motion to adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on this Bill, I have heard it said... frequently on this floor, that by tradition there are



never more than two Conference Committees on a Bill and that although that is the tradition, it is not specifically covered either in our Rules or the Joint Rules. My question to you, Sir... is if the House does not adopt this Conference Committee Report, what is the status of this Bill?"

Speaker Shea: "To be very honest, Sir... we don't have any Rules to cover it and I would assume... that we report to the Senate that we didn't adopt it... by that point the Leadership would be getting together trying to figure out how to untangle it."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, would that message to the Senate include a request for a Third Conference Committee?"

Speaker Shea: "No doubt that's what it would have to do when it left here, Sir."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Duff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker... further to that point, we have had this discussion in prior years and prior General Assemblies and I think it might be appropriate to ask the Speaker, his intentions... it is unprecedented to my knowledge... and perhaps it has taken place more years ago than I've been here, unprecedented to ever have a Third Conference Committee Report. Now, I think that if we're going to take a position it would be helpful if the Chair would tell us the Chair's position on that matter so that we aren't confronted at a later time with a tough decision."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "I make a point of order, Mr. Speaker. We're not at any of those points yet and I don't think the Speaker ought to rule on any point that we are not at... I think that is presumptuous at this point."

Speaker Shea: "I think you are correct, Sir. Now... on the



Bill, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan to explain his vote.... or to... on the discussion."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Williams and he indicates that he will."

Ryan: "Mr. Williams, will you tell me what Senate Amendment #5... does that add five hundred thousand dollars for a dam in Pekin, Illinois? Did the Conference Committee... that?"

Williams: "Yes, Representative Ryan..."

Ryan: "Tell me what the difference is in the dam and Pekin, as compared to the Middle Fork project in Danville."

Williams: "Well, from my understanding... the total cost of the dam in Dirksen Park in the City of Pekin, is five hundred thousand dollars... that's it... total. That's a flood control project, incidentally."

Ryan: "Did you also delete nine hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars for reconstruction of Batavia Dam?"

Williams: "That was an Amendment... put out here in the House, I did oppose that Amendment insofar as the..."

Ryan: "Conference Committee Report deletes that money does it not."

Williams: "Yes, that's correct and that was by an 8 to 2, vote... incidentally, in the Conference Committee."

Ryan: "And we have thirty-two thousand dollars for the Great Lake Basin Commission, is that right?"

Williams: "That's correct... that's our annual dues, actually the Great Lake Basin... as we pay our dues... also the Wabash and the Upper Miss."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems to me that it is very unfair to take care of Pekin... leave Batavia and Danville out... and it just doesn't seem to be too just to me... and I might point out to you, Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong with the information that I have... but I understand that maybe



the precedent has been set for a Third Conference Committee in the Senate this afternoon. I understand the Capitol Development Board on Second Conference Committee was defeated and placed on Postponed Consideration and so, you might check into that and see if that's a possibility and if that's the case... then I would urge that we do not adopt this Conference Committee Report and take it back and get it straightened out the way that it should be."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel that I have to rise now to defend my rating of the Illinois Environmental Council who rates the Legislators each year and I have a seventy... I rated a hundred and seventy-seven for which I'm proud. You know, in 1970, we created a monster when we created the Environmental Protection Agency and now we must pay for it to the tune of approximately three hundred million dollars a year... and they're the ones that's standing in the wings of the Reservoir and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that we should give Danville credit for trying to have an organized industrial development. They're providing for the water and resources necessary for economic growth... industrial growth. The biggest problems we have today in our industrial centers is the lack of clear water and lack of proper sewage and Danville was taking the steps early... before these problems developed so that they would not develop... and yet they're being criticized. Other places always criticize because they waited too late... there was no plan development so, I feel that we should go along and help Danville and the people there have an orderly



development of industrial society. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House

I'm not too proud to beg you to cast a 'no' vote to this terrible Conference Report. I want to publicly salute the distinguished Gentleman from Lake County, he has demonstrated anew, in this world it's the truth that stings. Not only are those of you who are trying to assassinate this project kowtowing to the Environmentalist.... you're kowtowing to the Senate which is equally reprehensible. Now, I want to say that.... the Gentleman from Lake County, he showed that he had the heart, the brains and the compassion... I'm not going to try to tug at the heart strings and say, let's win this for Charles Campbell... Charles Campbell has more friends on this floor than most of us... but I am going to say to you that it's not very sporting, Ladies and Gentlemen... when a man is lying on his back under an oxygen tent... to stand on the tubes that furnish the oxygen to him. You know what the effect would be to destroy the project for which he's lived for the past ten years. Five General Assemblies have gone on record... the solemn word promise of the Governor of the State of Illinois and all these General Assemblies are on the line. Let's be big enough to stand up and say we'll keep faith in what has been promised in the name of the State of Illinois... whether or not it's for the great seal of the 79th General Assembly. It has been pointed out here again and again, that Danville has put its money behind its mouth...it's gone to the polls... it overwhelmingly said, we will tax ourselves whatever is required, to bring this improvement to Central Illinois. Shame on you that say that we aren't entitled to some of the good things in life. It isn't



in my district either... but, I'm proud to say that I'm for it all the way and I beg you... vote 'no', and the Speaker has shown the way here by indicating to you, there will be more Conferences... Let that bugaboo... let that bugaboo be buried here and now.... that this would be the end of this project with the end of the whole appropriation, if you voted 'no'. Listen to your conscience... listen to your hearts, vote 'no'."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, let me first compliment Representative Cunningham, for not tugging at heart strings. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to lay one fear aside... and I want Representative Williams as Sponsor of this motion to listen, I want to lay one fear aside as far as the Departmental Appropriation is concerned... The Director of the Division of Waterways is in the rear of the Chamber and he doesn't support this Conference Committee Report... He's not worried about his budget, he's worried about doing something for the people of the Danville, Vermilion County and the Central part of the State by constructing a long, past-due lake that has been promised time and time again. I'm not talking for this project because of my friend Max Coffey, Chuck Campbell and long time friend Bob Craig, I'm talking about helping central and downstate Illinois. Every Governor in recent history has said that the life blood... of central and downstate Illinois is going to be industrial expansion and recreation. The good Lord only knows, you do not have industrial expansion... as clearly indicated by the remarks of Representative Keller, a moment ago... unless you have an adequate water supply. Not only for industrial use, but yes... for recreational use, you know and I know . when you talk about recreational potential of southern



Illinois and central Illinois... that you've got to have the lakes for boating, swimming, waterskiing... adequate water supply for industrial uses and yes, for home use. I don't care what the Senate has said... I don't care how many times they have said, no... to the House as far as this project is concerned. They have done it before and I join with my colleagues in asking you to stand on your own feet and tell the Senate they've got to talk to us... and don't worry about the Department losing its appropriation... it's not going to happen, you know it... I know it... there are other vehicles around here, just in the event that this one died. Don't be naive... don't be panicked... don't be stampeded... don't be led by the other side of the rotunda, certainly this motion to adopt this Conference Committee should be rejected and put some bipartisan thinking people on there... especially from the other side of the rotunda, that doesn't have their minds made up before they go into the Conference Committee meeting. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

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

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the motion received the requisite two-thirds vote and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams, to close."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't think there is any Member on the floor of this House that doesn't realize that I carried this Bill all the way up to Second Conference Committee... with the tortured vote that I made in the Conference Committee... I'm not opposed to the water supply there for Danville, or I wouldn't have been able to honestly carry it up



as far as I did. I have good friends on both sides of... pros and cons of this project. I would like to point out that in this appropriation are thirty-five flood control projects... running the length and width and breast of our State, the appropriation as it stands now is, 13.888 million dollars, a reduction of six hundred and eight thousand dollars from the original introduction. I think that the reservoir there is probably the right project... it may be the wrong time of the State's economy. I might point out that the Senate has concurred in its Conference Committee Report by a vote of 35 to 16, and we stand at this point now and I renew my motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report #2, on House Bill 3417."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #2, on House Bill 3417. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook... or from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein to explain his vote."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason that I would like to explain my vote... is the money for the Batavia Dam, has been taken out and they have been repairing that dam since last October. Now, if the rest of it washes out... and you've got mud flash up there right now... and the accelerator plant over in Batavia or DuPage County, expects to use water from a pool up there... I wonder what kind of mud they're going to get over in... at the accelerator plant. Now, I don't say to use this right now... but have it available so if the repairs that are being made with clay and stone... no concrete... mind you... and it's a heavy water fall there at Batavia, I want to have that money available so they can build...."



repair the dam and build a new dam to replace the concrete one that has partially washed out. I must vote 'no' on this and the Senate did not grant me the courtesy to let me know that they had removed that dam... money for that dam over in the Senate... of course I will never walk into that Senate... I'm not wearing a necktie. I'm very sorry."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Macdonald to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The hour is very late and I think that all of us are probably very, very tired. I rise to explain my vote to say that it is true that I consider myself an environmentalist and yet in this crucial fiscal year in Illinois, I have had to sacrifice some of those positions to the economy and to priority conditions. This is a time for priorities in the General Assembly in Illinois and I think that water resources, water supply should be a major and overriding issue in concern for all of us. I would like to be able to afford the Middle Fork project for Illinois. I have no prejudice against this particular project but I think that this particular time that five and a half millions dollars for this particular reservoir is not feasible for Illinois and I urge an 'aye' vote to get this Conference... Second Conference Committee Report passed and to have us look at our priorities and perspectives and do the right thing for Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, The Assistant Majority Leader, Mr. Davis to explain his vote."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. About sixty-five years ago, I believe... when I was like some of these youngsters running around here



I remember distinctively... reading the poem and having the teacher elaborate on it and I thought how terrible it must have been... water... water everywhere and all the boards did shrink, water... and not a drop to drink, you know that is Ancient Mariner. But I hope this is perhaps the last night we will be here to assemble... I hope it is, and I hope that when all of us leave this place we'll have the knowledge of good work completed in which we took part in. I have been praying for my distinguished friend Chuck Campbell, who on many occasions have come to my rescue... we've served on the advisory Committee together and his charity has been as broad as the needs of the people that I represent. And now, as a fitting tribute to his memory and to the fact that his distinguished and lovely wife told me that he hoped to go home Saturday and that the people in his district has put their money where their mouth is... I'm going to vote 'no' for Chuck Campbell."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer to explain his vote."

Meyer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to renew the point of order as to the status of this Bill in the event that it does not receive 89 votes."

Speaker Shea: "Then the Gentleman's motion will have failed."

Meyer: "What is the status of the Legislation then?"

Speaker Shea: "We will tell the Senate we failed to adopt the Second Conference Committee."

Meyer: "What about the Third Conference Committee?"

Speaker Shea: "That I can't answer until..."

Meyer: "Would you get the Parliamentian up there..."

Speaker Shea: "I don't think the Parliamentian can tell you anymore than I can, Mr. Meyer, there is nothing in the Rules on it."

Meyer: "Well, if... would you make a ruling... determination..."



Speaker Shea: "I can't make a ruling until such an event happens and I'm not going to take a crystal ball and look into the future. Mr.... The Gentleman from Cook..."

Meyer: "One last question."

Speaker Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Meyer: "Where our rules are silent, Roberts Rules of Order then carries on... correct, Sir?"

Speaker Shea: "That is what rule 71, says. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten to explain his vote."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The merits and pros and cons of the Middle Fork, I think have been debated very well. I think when we look at our priorities to establish what we're going to do with our money this year that it's just plain common sense that we can't afford the Middle Fork this year. But, if we should... apparently the will of this House will be... not adopt this report, let me explain to you what will probably happen. We still have a Bill, House Bill 1932 or Senate Bill 1932, that will have in it all such items as collective bargaining, the Middle Fork, it will have revenue sharing back to the City of Chicago, it may have RTA on it and at the last minute before we adjourn, you're going to be asked to compromise your position on all of these various matters and vote for a Bill that will not only include these things in it but all the funding for all the Legislative Commissions of the House. I think that it is a travesty to think that that will probably be our posture in the wee hours in the morning and if you think that on this side of the aisle, by voting red you're doing yourself a service... you'll really be doing yourself a disservice when that Bill comes before this House in the wee hours and I think you ought to reconsider that position and get this



matter out of the way once and for all by voting green."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Riccolo to explain his vote."

Riccolo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose this Conference Committee Report on two reasons. First of all, in Appropriations Committee the people from the Danville area came in and presented very clear evidence why... they needed this reservoir in their district. And, second and most important to me... as I think it should be to the rest of you Ladies and Gentlemen in this Chamber, is the fact that the two senior veterans from that district that this Bill is vitally important to... are not here tonight but at one time or another each one of those Gentleman have very probably held each one of you on what you call a pork barrel issue for your district. And, I'll be damned if I'll feed their Bill to the jackals that they have been waiting for, for eight years. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "For starters, I think everyone ought to know that Charlie Campbell will be out of the hospital this Friday. Preservation of the environment has something to do with this vote but waste has more to do with it. We are going to waste 5.5 million dollars times 1.73, if we reject this... Conference Committee Report and if a future Conference Committee Report puts back in what the Governor asks for. But in reality we're going to waste 19.1 million times 1.73, which is over thirty million dollars. Let me put it in the words of the Vermilion County Soil and Water Conservation District Chariman, 'we specifically feel other items, including



education and transportation could utilize any available tax money better and far more effectively than if that money were used for reservoirs.<sup>1</sup> The cry has gone up that Vermilion County and Danville needs more water... since 1971, there are five hundred and ninety-eight....."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Skinner: "Five hundred and ninety-eight million fewer gallons of water being used. The water gallonage... according to the Water Company is down 18%, that is a serious reason to support...."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from... or the Lady from Champaign, Miss Satterthwaite, you have one minute to explain your vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise again to remind you of the Senate debate that took place in the House Appropriations Committee on the issue of the Middle Fork... the overwhelming decision of our own Committee was to delete the project. There are only two reasons for any kind of a dam on the Middle Fork for... for recreation and water supply for the City of Danville. I do not believe that the State can afford to subsidize that project just because it is a political boondoggle for that area. We have other ways of providing recreation in that area at a much lower cost to the State and a much higher return for the dollars invested. We cannot afford to be frivolous with State dollars even if it comes from bonded funds. I urge you all to let reason prevail and vote for the economic thing...."

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, please."

Sttterthwaite: "Vote for only those economic projects that we can afford rather than the expensive and thrift kind of projects such as the Middle Fork."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Williams, to explain his vote for one



minute."

Williams: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can't in anyway shape or form see my colleagues on the other side there from Chicago and Cook County being opposed to this Bill. I just want to let you know, out of the thirty-two flood control projects there are 2.3 million dollars in here for Cook County... if you want to see this go down the drain... then stay on a red vote, if you want to support the flood control project... they you'll get off the red there and on the green or at least come out and vote. There's 2.3 million here for Cook County and there is something here for every area of the State of Illinois in project to be done in this year here for flood control."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff... one minute to explain your vote, Sir."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, finally I just want to support what the previous speaker said. I have... in fact unlike the Gentleman from Champaign, voted for every dam and every lake that has been offered since I've been in the General Assembly and I'm not going to vote for this one for the one reason... we cannot afford it this year and the second reason, that the very people who want this is the people who have prevented us from getting money for flood control which we need so desperately in the fast growing portions of Cook and the collar counties. It's a spot... I would love to be able to vote for the dam... I would love to be able to give Chuck Campbell a vote... but we can't."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. O'Daniel, one minute to explain your vote."

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I very seldom speak on the House floor but on one of the previous Bills... one of the colleagues criticized the



Union Officials for being in the balcony. I would like to call your attention to the group above the Speaker's stand in the left hand side of the balcony and you'll see the biggest reason that most of our projects all over the State and all over the middle west are blocked. Almost known by first names... they go into an area where people are trying to do something for their community and they stir up opposition and block all of our worthwhile projects. This is a real good project... the Department of Conservation approved it, the local people are in support of it and I don't think a handful of people should be running all over the State and other States and stopping good projects and I can't understand how a few people can come to this General Assembly and change people's thinking on a good project that the people who pay the taxes and supports this State are supporting. And, I vote 'no' proudly."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman asks for a poll of the absentees. Give a Conference Committee announcement while we're waiting for the Roll Call to come out of the machine."

Clerk O'Brien: "At 7:30 there is a Conference Committee on House Bill 3411, the appointed Members are Representative Van Duyne, Lechowicz, Bradley, Totten and Ryan. Meet at 7:30 in the East House Corridor."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Van Duyne, 'aye'. Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Mr. Speaker, we've been here now for almost ten hours and I know the press likes to take their pictures but some of us are getting tired, I know the fellows don't want to be caught in compromising positions of course, I'm speaking about on the floor of the House. And, therefore I would certainly appreciate if you would



turn off the red light and let us relax a little bit while we go about this exercise."

Speaker Shea: "Leave. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Campbell, Capuzi, Carroll, Craig, Darrow, Ewell, Fleck, Hudson, J.D. Jones, Kent, Klosak, LaFleur, Lauer, Lucco, Madison, Maragos, McPartlin, Rose, Stearney, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Vitek, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 85 'ayes' and 64 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Calendar appears... on the Calendar... for what purpose do you arise, Mr. Meyer?"

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if you would get the Parliamentarian out here because since our last discussion... I have a copy of Roberts Rules of Order revised... the classic 1915 edition, and it appears that Roberts Rules of Order are also silent on the point."

Speaker Shea: "Is that the newly revised or just the revised?"

Meyer: "This is the revised...."

Speaker Shea: "We are now using the newly revised..."

Meyer: "This is 1975 edition, it has got to be an up-to-date edition."

Speaker Shea: "Well, that's the problem we always have... it's the newly revised."

Meyer: "I now have the newly revised one... but, seriously Mr. Speaker, I...."

Speaker Shea: "I'm asking him to come out, Sir."

Meyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Yes, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know why the Gentleman keeps insisting that our rules are silent on this. Our rules are very clear on this, it does not preclude a Third Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Shea: "On the order of non concurrence on Supplemental



Calendar #5. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, on Supplemental Calendar on the Speaker's table on nonconcurrency."

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd move that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1739. This is a Bill that we passed out about two or three hours ago that deals with the option of self-insurance and Department of Risk Management. I don't think the Senate understands it so I'd ask that we not recede and we'll explain it to them in a Conference Committee."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, moves that the House refuse to recede on House Amendment #4 on Senate Bill 1739 and ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee. On that is there discussion? Mr. Meyer, on this Bill..."

Meyer: "No, Sister, no..."

Speaker Shea: "We're not in Catholic school tonight. I'll get back to you..."

Meyer: "No, I just want to make the point that you're not going to move that Bill out and direct the Clerk to send a message to the Senate while we're resolving a point of order. Do I have your word on that?"

Speaker Shea: "I will let the Bill take its course."

Meyer: "No, Sir, that isn't my question. Mr. Speaker, you and I served together since 1966 down here and I don't think it's fair for you to delay this and in the meantime order the Clerk to send a message to the Senate."

Speaker Shea: "I'm not going to do anything, Sir."

Meyer: "Are you going to direct the Clerk not to send the message?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Meyer, I won't jeopardize your position."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, either you got a yes or no and you gotta word in this business and I know your word is good but I need an answer."

Speaker Shea: "I don't have the answer, Mr. Meyer, I'm trying to find it out for you. All right?"

Meyer: "Well, you can certainly direct the Clerk not to send a message over to the Senate."

Speaker Shea: "The Clerk will not do anything right now."

Meyer: "Thank you."



Speaker Shea: "Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #4 and request a Conference Committee. All in favor of that vote aye; those opposed nay. In the opinion of the Chair the motion carries and we will so inform the Senate. Now let's see, Mr. Boyle has got on Supplemental Calendar #3 appears a Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3403. The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3403 and I'd be happy to answer any questions of the Members."

Speaker Shea: "Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle, has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee on House Bill 3403 and on that is there debate? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to one question?"

Boyle: "Yes, go ahead..."

Schraeder: "Does this have any collective bargaining problems in it?"

Boyle: "No, I can assure you this is the Conservation Appropriation Bill and I...we don't have anything, any problems."

Schraeder: "Thank you, that's good enough. That's good enough."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "May I ask the Sponsor a question, please? I don't have a copy of that report, Mr. Sponsor, could you tell us what the ...in essence, the Conference Report is different than the Bill?"

Boyle: "All right. Part of the Carlinville Police Station...the Conference Committee Report puts the \$40,000 back into Law Enforcement...if I knew specifically what you were asking. The Seven Mile Project is out, the eagles are...the bald eagles are into \$100,000. Ted's eagles are in, the Seven Mile Project is out. Tell me specifically what you're..."

Geo-Karis: "Yes, in our digests there was a Senate Amendment 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and we had House Amendments 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15,



16 and 17. Can you tell me if there was any addition made to these Amendments? Any additional funds?"

Boyle: "No. No, there were some cuts; some of them are out."

Geo-Karis: "Are there no other than the ones...no additional matter put on then, is that right?"

Boyle: "No, there's no added starters. We tried to get the Carlinville Police Station in there but it wasn't germane."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further debate? Is there further...the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. Mr. Dunn, Mr. Dunn, excuse me for a minute. Would the Members please be in their seats and could we have some order in the House. There are people on the floor of the House that are not entitled, would they please remove themselves? Proceed."

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

Boyle: "Yes."

Dunn: "All right. The Conference Committee report is pretty detailed, would you please explain what changes this makes in the Bill in terms that even I might understand?"

Boyle: "I don't know specifically what Amendments you're talking about. Senate Amendment, if you want me to do it, I'll do it Amendment by Amendment but it's going to be a long...Senate Amendment #1, the Senate receded from Amendment #1. Amendment #1 was a reduction of \$372,800 in Mine and Historic Sites. \$96,300 in administrative services. \$78,700 in acquisition and development. \$676,500 reduction in Natural Resource Management. The Senate receded from 1 and from #3. Now some of 3 is in there. Union County Refuge Draining and Ditching for \$100,000 is in. The Seven Mile Lake Project is out. Ten Mile Lake is out. The bald eagles are reduced from 710,000 to 100,000. We didn't get the whole nest but we give the bald eagles a toupee. The..."

Speaker Shea: "Would you confine your remarks to the Bill?"

Boyle: "The Cairo Custom House is out. Do you have a specific question concerning the Bill?"

Dunn: "No, just very detailed Conference Committee Report and I..."



Boyle: "All right. Well, the \$40,000 is put back in for travel in Law Enforcement. The House concurs in 2, 4 and 7. Two is the 224,000 for Hazlett Park. And 4 is Partee's 50% Amendment. That's it."

Dunn: "What about pages 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7? What do they do?"

Boyle: "All right. Now, on the Conference Committee in order to get the money back in Law Enforcement they had to go through the whole part of Senate Amendment #1, that's why Forestry's in there. That's...if you'll look at that's the restatement of the Bill as it originally was."

Dunn: "Is the Conference Committee Report now the Bill then, is that what you're saying?"

Boyle: "The Conference Committee Report is always the Bill that's why it takes 89 votes, Mr...Representative."

Dunn: "No. No. That's not what I mean, you know that. We have pages 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are essentially all numbers and without the Bill to compare things line by line, I can't tell what it does. I think it's a fair question to ask you to summarize and explain what you've done here."

Boyle: "This all replaces things that were taken out by Amendments 1 and 3. That runs pages 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6."

Dunn: "Never mind. I've got a staffperson here maybe she can summarize it."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to point out to this Membership that we've only been working on this Conference Committee close to two days meeting between the House and Senate as far as coming agreements and in turn there is an agreement. If you take a look at the total number of signatures on the Conference Committee, it's almost unanimous. Let me just point out to this Membership as the Department of Conservation was introduced to the House, it came in for a figure of \$66,864,600. When it left, after the Committee action there was a change of approximately, a reduction of \$726,500. The House in its wisdom added approximately \$1,418,000 in various projects. In turn the Senate action re-



duced it to approximately 63.2 million. Conference Committee action as it now stands before you is \$64,047,900. The Senate receded from the cuts that were contained in Amendments 1, 3, 5 and 8. And as it was pointed out by the Sponsor of Senate Amendment #8 reduced the operations in capital for a figure of \$1,381,000. Senate Amendment #3 reduced or eliminated various projects and the projects that have been restored have been stated on this floor. Senate Amendment #5 was...restored \$198,400 in Operations and reduced \$314,000 in Improvements. Senate... #8 lumped sum the amount which was contained for a \$75,000 project. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Conference Committee has met a number of times and I would strongly encourage the adoption of Conference Committee 1 to House Bill 3403."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from DeKalb...The Gentleman from Grundy, the Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was going to point out too that this Conference Committee Report does contain my name. And this Conference Committee Report is the way a Conference Committee Report should be written, it's in complete detail for the entire Bill and perhaps it makes it a little more complicated for the Membership to read and understand. I happen to be a Member of this Conference Committee Report and all Members agreed that it should be the entire Bill and Representative Boyle did point out the changes that were made and they're incorporated in here but we did re-write the entire Bill, not in substance or in figures, but to make the adjustments so that it would be presented in its final and total form and it is a good Conference Committee Report. We did work hard on it and it contains nine signatures and certainly I would support Representative Boyle."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "Chairman Boyle, I have no position at this point but you said something that makes me curious. You say you restored fund



JUN 30 1976

254.

to the Department of Law Enforcement?"

Boyle: "That's correct."

Kosinski: "What funds were restored for what purpose?"

Boyle: "We put the money back in for the additional game wardens and for their travel."

Kosinski: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Boyle: "Yes."

Peters: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that the Committee has worked extremely hard on this and this is probably one of the finest Conference Committee Reports in regard to a particular Department they have really done a fine job on it and I'm certainly going to vote for it. But Representative Boyle, I don't recall one thing coming out of these discussions. I know in regard to Representative Meyer you did indicate that we are doing something for the bald eagles. Was there anything in here in the plans of the Department of Conservation to do something for the pigeons?"

Boyle: "I don't know. If you're talking about the carrier pigeon, I believe they've already done something for him and he's now extinct."

Peters: "I thought so. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed nay. In the opinion of the Chair the motion carries. The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle, to close."

Boyle: "I'd merely close, Mr. Speaker, by saying this is a good Conference Committee Report and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3043? All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller, to explain his vote."



6-30-76  
 Keller: "Mr. Speaker, I really don't want to explain my vote but I would like to correct something. He said that the 100,000 for the Ten Mile Lake was taken out but it was just a reduction of 24,000, I just wanted to correct the record."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 146 ayes; no nays; 1 Member voting present. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3403. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, arise?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in behalf of the people of Crawford County to say 'thank you' for authorizing Lake Michigan South and we thank you very much and invite you next year to the ...when we cut the ribbon for it."

Speaker Shea: "You're welcome. On the order of Conference Committee meeting."

Clerk O'Brien: "Eight o'clock announcement for a Conference Committee for Senate Bills 1739. Appointed Members are Representatives Berman, Merlo, Darrow, Deavers and Epton. Eight o'clock in the east House corridor."

Speaker Shea: "On the order of Conference Committee Reports on Supplemental Calendar #3 appears Senate Bill 1997. And on that the Gentleman from Cook, D. L. Houlihan. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leinenweber, arise? We'll get to you, Sir."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this is the Conference Committee Report of Senate Bill 1997 which deals with the subject of supervision, the legislation being necessitated because of the decision, the recent decision of the Illinois Supreme Court in People vs 'Brane'. The Conference Committee Report contains what essentially was the House version of the Supervision Bill; absent the required consent of the state's attorney before a court could place a defendant on supervision. It had the... Conference Committee Report has been approved and signed by all of the House Members of the Conference Committee which are Representative Duff, Palmer, Getty, Shea and myself; and by the



Senate Members who are: Daley, D'Arco, Mohr, Carroll and Senator Roe did not sign the Conference Committee Report. We feel that this Conference Committee Report does bring the House and Senate versions into balance. It is a reasonable Supervision Bill and we ask for your support."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1997. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Leinenweber: "All right. First of all, Representative Houlihan, I believe you stated that under the First Conference Committee Report the state's attorney's consent to an order of supervision is not required. Is that correct?"

Houlihan: "That is correct. It is not as was in the original House version mandated before the court could place the defendant on supervision."

Leinenweber: "All right. Secondly,..."

Houlihan: "But it does provide, Mr. Leinenweber, considering whether or not a defendant shall be placed on supervision the court shall consider the statement of the prosecuting authority with respect to it."

Leinenweber: "All right. What is the limit to the court's jurisdiction under this Conference Committee Report for imposing supervision? What class of crimes is the defendant eligible for supervision?"

Houlihan: "On anything other than a felony."

Leinenweber: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like briefly to discuss the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "All right. There is a very important principle at stake in this Conference Committee Report and this Report violates that principle and because of the fact that it violates this principle every single state's attorney in this state and



specifically the State's Attorney Association of Illinois is unalterably opposed to this Conference Committee Report. The important principle is whether or not a court in its own discretion may nullify a prosecution. Historically, this has always been a prosecutorial function and not a function of judiciary. It has always been the function, historically, of the prosecutor to decide who should be prosecuted and what charge a person... ought to be placed against an individual. It has always been the function of a judge to determine guilt or innocence and the appropriate sentence. Now despite what you make think, supervision is not a sentence; it is not a form of a sentence. It is a conscious decision that an individual for whatever reason ought not to be prosecuted. This has always been a prosecutorial function and it ought not to be placed in the hands of the judiciary. I might remind you that this Conference Committee Report, if it becomes law, will enable a judge on his own decision to decide that an individual who is shown to be guilty of a specific set of facts nevertheless deserves not to be prosecuted. This is a very vast departure from what the law has always been and it is one that all the state's attorneys in this state are unalterably opposed to. This Bill, like some other Bills, this Bill did not come out of Judiciary II, I remind you in this form. It came out in a form that was acceptable to the State's Attorneys Association of Will County. Judiciary II and specifically a Subcommittee of which I was a Member had hearings on this Bill and we found this out. The Subcommittee reported to the full Committee a recommendation that the prosecutors retain the right to oppose and to prevent the imposition of supervision. The Judiciary II Committee which has never been known for being an ultraconservative force in this General Assembly nevertheless voted out a Bill giving the prosecutor the veto power. This is as it should be. In this Bill, we are kowtowing to the Senate which for some reason known to them, decides that the prosecutors ought to be left out. All there is in here is the possibility that the state's attorney will be asked what his position and the judge does not in any way,



shape or form have to pay any attention to it. This is a bad Conference Committee Report. We ought to send them back and have the conferees put in the House version which is a far superior version to this. As some other Bills that have come before this General Assembly and Criminal Law have been dealt with, this one deserves more than 100 votes in opposition. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, obviously the hour continues to get later but again we have some very important legislation and I think you better pay close attention to this Bill because it's only your vote away, plus the signature of the Governor, from becoming the law of the State of Illinois. Now just what is supervision? I don't think many of you really know what it is. Representative Leinenweber tried to tell you. This is another one for the defendant. You know, under the law of the State of Illinois we already have some rights for that defendant. The first one is, of course, he is entitled to probation. I don't think we have to argue with that concept. But if probation is not enough for the defendant we also have conditional discharge. In addition to the conditional discharge of course we have plea bargaining and I think you all know about plea bargaining. And now we're going to go forth and we're going to have supervision which means it's a complete wipe-out of the crime that has been committed by the defendant. I hate to say what is coming next but at the rate this General Assembly is going I imagine the next thing we're going to have is discretionary indictment. And the next thing we'll do is ask the defendant, do you really want to be indicted? I'm telling you, you better take a look at this one. This thing is set up now so that the defense attorney can get together with the judge in chambers and make any decision that they want in regard to the defendant. I say to you if you took this home to the people in your district and said to them, I say to you take it home, ask them about plea bargaining."



How do the people in your district feel about plea bargaining? They'll tell you how. As a prosecutor I recognize that we have to have plea bargaining. It's a reality. But I want to tell you this is plea bargaining at its absolute greatest. In fact it's so great that no longer do we have to have three people sit down anymore, all we have to do is have the judge and the defense attorney. Now the theory of this Bill is that the judge is going to stand up for the people's rights. I ask you, do you feel that your judiciary is standing up for your rights? If you think so, ask the people back in your district. Ask them what they think about plea bargaining when the state's attorney and the judge and the defense counsel sit down. They'll tell you what they think about plea bargaining. Then ask them 'how do you feel when the only person to stand up for your rights is going to have absolutely nothing to say about it', and that's going to be your state's attorney? And whether you like your state's attorneys or not put yourself in his position. How would you like to be sitting in his office with the victim of a crime and the victim of the crime says what's going on? My wife was mugged out in the park. It was a battery. They went before the judge and the defense attorney was there and they worked out a deal whereby they were completely dismissing the charge. They're getting rid of it completely. You're now the state's attorney. What do you say to that victim? Are you going to sit there and say I'm sorry but the General Assembly passed a law that says I have absolutely nothing to say about it, I may be the state's attorney, I may be the protector of your rights, but that happens to be the law, they can deal the thing out anyway they want to and I have nothing to say. You try to justify that to the victim of the crime. This is a horrendous Bill. It deserves a 100 no votes."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to speak on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to have Mr. Jaffe who is the Sponsor of the Department of Children and



Family Services call our office wherever he might be so that we could get together with him on when he would like to call the Second Conference on the Department of Children and Family Services. I hope we can do that sometime this evening or early in the morning so that we can all get together. Wherever he might be, if he's within the sound of my voice or within the earshot, would he please give us a call so we could go ahead and get the work of the House done. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Porter: "Dan, looking at page 2 what seems to be between lines 84 and 85. It uses the word 'the history, character and condition of the offender'. Would you interpret that language to mean that the court could consider the prior criminal record of the defendant in coming to a decision in regard to the appropriateness for supervision?"

Houlihan: "Yes."

Porter: "My suggestion is that when you go back for the Second Conference Committee Report..."

Houlihan: "Assuming that there will be one."

Porter: "And I think there will be. That specifically be put in one of the three conditions underneath so it's absolutely clear. I think, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that based upon what Representative Sangmeister said about this, that he knows far more about it than anyone, I think, in the House that undoubtedly this will go back for a Second Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed..." The ayes have it. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close the debate. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, arise?"



Duff: "On the motion, Mr. Speaker, the Chair recognized only opponents to the Bill and I didn't hear the question on the previous...whether the previous question had the votes but I think that there should have been allowed somebody to speak in favor of the Bill in addition to the Sponsor. I just make that point."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Duff. Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen with all due respect to my colleagues Representative Leinenweber and Sangmeister, I respectfully submit that they have grossly, and I emphasize the word grossly, misstated the issue that is before this House. I realize that they are lawyers. I also happen to be a lawyer and I also happen to have considerable experience as an assistant state's attorney in Cook County. I know what the word supervision is about. I know how it is used. It is a very very useful vehicle in the courts of this state for disposing of minor cases which clog the dockets which takes care of the first offenders whose conduct is not worth charging them in having them convicted of a criminal offense. Supervision has been a recognized vehicle for many, many years particularly in the urban areas of this state for the disposition of such cases. Now at no time in the history of this state has a state's attorney had a veto power over a judge's sentencing authority and if we ever start it we won't need judges we'll just need state's attorneys. And when that day comes we will rue it. Now as soon as we put a veto power in here over a judge you will see no supervision particularly in an election year because the first thing... because the first thing the state's attorney is going to say is we make no agreements on anything, we're not going to take the heat, that isn't what we're elected to do, that's that judge's prerogative. Now this is what this is all about. Don't take it out of context. This Conference Committee has been agreed to by all five House Members and by four of the five Senators. It represents a broad spectrum here of view as far as the Members of this House. This Bill deserves your support. If we don't adopt



it we are going to have a terrible time here because we won't have a legislative base for supervision. I ask the support of the Members of the House."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1997. All those in favor signify by saying aye; all those opposed by voting no. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, to explain his vote for one minute."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for one minute I'm going to try to talk fast. I never have heard more crap in my life than the opposition that was put to this Bill. Those Gentlemen aren't arguing before a jury with a closing argument, they should be telling the truth. This Bill doesn't restrict, it does more than supervision did before it was offered. This Bill doesn't even allow the courts to give supervision for felonies which they have always been able to do. This Bill is supported by people on that Conference Committee like the Gentleman who proposed it; by the spokesman of the House Judiciary Committee; by Rich Daley, the Chairman of the Committee in the Senate. This Bill has been worked out as a very, very important to a Supreme Court need. The Chicago Crime Commission has supported this Bill, they had one question which I believe is answered within the Bill. And when you talk about the state's attorneys opposing it, the state's attorneys in this state with their paid lobbyist of \$40,000 a year come down here constantly to try to pressure us to do things that are not in the interest of the people. This Bill is about as good a Bill as you could possibly create on this issue."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, to explain his vote for one minute."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representatives Leinenweber and Sangmeister raised a valid point in saying that they would rather have the consent of the prosecutor in there. I, too, joined them previously in that view. I do not think that it presents any constitutional prohibition. I believe that it does indeed raise a question either way in the manner in which you had



the consent of the prosecutor you raise the question of an incursion of the judicial authority. In a Bill that does not have it such as this you raise a question into the incursion into the state's attorneys authority. I think the overriding consideration is that we must, in order to continue our criminal justice system, have a good supervision. Indeed, I believe this is a good supervision Bill. It is one which specifically has language which directs the court to consider the statement and consideration of the state's attorney. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, that is why I support this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 ayes; 39 nos; 1 voting present. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1997. On the...for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if you saw my light on before you took the Roll?"

Speaker Madigan: "No, I didn't."

Madison: "May I be recorded as aye?"

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Madison as aye. On the Fourth Supplemental Calendar on the order of Conference Committee Reports there appears Senate Bill 1603. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1603. The report which is signed by all Members would ask that the House recede from House Amendments 2 and 3. Amendment 2 would be a reduction of \$31,000 in contractual services for arbitrators. Amendment #3 would be a reduction of \$14,000 in the Affirmative Action Program. The Conference Committee would also amend the Bill to include a \$6,160 step increases in the Affirmative Action Program and also line item...printing and commodity items. I would move for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."



Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1603. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "One question of the Sponsor..."

Speaker Madigan: "Do you question whether the Sponsor will yield?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "He indicates that he will yield."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, can you tell me with the Conference Report did they reduce the appropriations already encountered by both the House and the Senate?"

Kozubowski: "Yes, Representative Geo-Karis, it's a \$38,700 net reduction."

Geo-Karis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer.

There being no further discussion, the question is shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1603? All those in favor signify by voting aye; all those opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 ayes; 2 no; 1 voting present and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1603. Mr. Katz, do you wish to call your Bill? On the Third Supplemental Calendar, Conference Committee Reports there appears House Bill 2736. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was introduced as part of a series of revisory Bills. All of the other Bills in the series passed overwhelmingly in both Houses. The purpose of the series was to make nonsubstantive revisory changes deleting or mending obsolete and archaic provisions. For example, some of the provisions dated back to the 1870 Constitution and has never been changed. This particular Bill was the Bill that amended the Election Code to make these nonsubstantive changes. Most of the changes in the original Bill dealt with the change in terminology in the court system including the titles of courts and manner of appeals. In the



Senate five Amendments were added. The Senate Amendments here made some minor technical changes and brought into the Bill two additional categories of nonsubstantive changes. To amend the Election Code to reflect the current Illinois voter residency requirement which is 30 days in the precinct; and second, to amend the Election Code in regard to the registration and voting of nonresident citizens. These changes are necessary to conform the Illinois Election Code to the provisions of the Congressional Oversea Citizens Voting Rights Act of 1975. These changes have been very carefully worked on by the Republican staff in the House and the Senate; by the Democratic staff in the House and the Senate. This is a unanimous Conference Committee Report. In the final form this Conference Committee Report simply brings our Election Code up-to-date to include the Congressional Enactment that by operation of law become part of our Election Code. It is still, essentially, a revisory Bill. It makes no substantive changes that are not already in the Election Code by operation of federal law. There has been no opposition expressed to any provision in this Bill despite the painstaking work done on it by the Republican and Democratic staffs in both Houses. I would urge that we concur in the unanimous Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2736."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates he will yield."

Friedrich: "Are you saying that the present law provides that you can vote for a person running for county office, he only lived in the state for 30 days?"

Katz: "Excuse me, I didn't..."

Friedrich: "Well, you didn't..."

Katz: "Well, as I understand the 30 day provision here, has been read into all of the state laws as a result of a United States Supreme Court decision. Now, I am frank to tell you that the fundamental work on this redrafting was done by David Epstein and by all of



staff people. I see that he is not here right at this moment but the affect of the decision of the United States Supreme Court does make one a citizen with the residency requirement of 30 days. Whether we put it in our code or not it is a fact as the results of the operation of the decision of the United States Supreme Court. If the Gentleman has questions that are technical in nature I did distribute this early but I would be very glad to have someone more technically competent in the details of the Election Code come over and see you and I would take it out of the record. I am told that it makes absolutely no substantive change not already in our Code as a result of Supreme Court decisions in Congressional enactment."

Friedrich: "I would appreciate it if you would do that for a few minutes."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Friedrich, the Chair recognizes Mr. Byers who apparently is in a position to answer your question. Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we passed a Bill last year and it's signed into law now, only requires 30 day's residence in the state to be eligible to vote in a county election or any election. Representative Satterthwaite was the Sponsor of that Bill that requires 30 days and that was signed into law."

Friedrich: "Then why does this Bill show the 6 months is marked out and the 30 days is here? If that's the present law why does it show it as a change in this Amendment?"

Byers: "I'm sorry, that passed the House but not the Senate."

Friedrich: "That's what I'm talking about. The law presently says that other than for a federal officer, for a national officer, that it's six months. So there is a very substantial change and that's why I was trying to call your attention."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I am quite agreeable to the suggestion that it be taken out of the record and..."

Speaker Madigan: "Take this Bill out of the record. On the order of Conference Committee Reports on the Fourth Supplemental Calendar there appears Senate Bill 1936. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."



Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we took 1936 back to Conference Committee and tried to resolve the questions that were brought up here on the floor to everyone's satisfaction and we think we have done that, to most of the people's satisfaction. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call and that we adopt the Conference Report, the Second Conference Report, on Senate Bill 1936."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, in your first...in your Second Conference Report there was only about a million dollar's difference, is that right?"

Mudd: "Yes, Ma'am."

Geo-Karis: "Now, is this the Second Conference Report?"

Mudd: "Yes, Ma'am."

Geo-Karis: "All right. Did you cut any money off or did you add it on?"

Mudd: "No, we add...in Second Conference Committee Report we added \$1,283,000 over what the First Conference Report had."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the non-signatories on the Second Conference Committee Report was myself. And the reason as was pointed out in the answer to the Lady's question from Lake is the farther we go in the Conference Committee the more we seem to add. I don't know what the bottom line is on this right now but it's somewhere over \$80,000,000. I was opposed to the original Bill as it came out of the House because of the large amount of money in it. The First Conference Committee added money and the Second Conference Committee has done exactly the same thing. I don't think this is a good practice. There are many projects that are worthwhile in here. It's my understanding that also as Senate Bill 1936 on the Second Conference Committee Report



sits postponed in the Senate and I don't think that we should act to adopt the Second Conference Committee Report anymore than many Members who have wished to add projects to other Bills have felt the Conference Committee Report should not be adopted. This is entirely too much money. It's got many projects in it that are not feasible at this time and in addition it's way too much operation money in CDB Board at this time."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of Conference Committee #2. Let me tell you exactly what transpired at a difference of opinion between 1 and 2 and the reason why it was reconsidered. It was reconsidered on a couple of House projects that in turn the Membership of this House supported. One being Representative Younge's project in her area and in turn it's been discussed many, many times. The second item of discussion was Representatives Cunningham, Keller and O'Daniel's projects and that's been discussed many, many times. And the third area of concern was for Representative Zeke Giorgi. If we can't stand up for the House Members I don't know who we are going to be standing up for. That's the only bone of contention in this budget and it deserves your resounding aye vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Sponsor of this abortion bill..."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Skinner: "How much is the bottom line this time around?"

Mudd: "The bottom line I believe is...would be 80,484,260."

Skinner: "How much more than last time?"

Mudd: "Be 1,283,000."

Skinner: "Boy. Mr. Speaker, if I may address the issue."

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

Lechowicz: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."



Lechowicz: "My point is that the budget was submitted at a figure of \$96,000,000 and now we're talking about 80,000,000."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Doesn't sound like a point of order to me."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, in order to create a gargoyle about which the editorial cartoonists will really be able to have a field day, I would suggest we vote no on this concurrence of this Conference Committee Report so that we may stuff all of the separate garbage bags into the one omnibus bill and that all the RTA supporters that took a dive on the Middle Fork can hold their nose while they're voting in favor of their local pork barrel projects in this Bill and all the commissions that keep all of us afloat with staffs that we can't get on our Committees. Now why don't we have one huge gargoyle, and look up the definition if you want to know how appropriate the word is when used in this context, the only way we can get there is by voting no on this. It will be extremely fiscally responsible thing to do because as we all know Capital Development Board money does not come from the good fairy, it comes from the poor overburdened taxpayer, the sucker in the State of Illinois, the state symbol. You know I was walking on the lawn the other day and I came across the statue of the coal miner and I'm wondering when we're going to appropriate \$25,000 to build a statue of the taxpayer clothed in a wooden barrel. No, I guess it wouldn't be a wooden barrel, it would probably be a cardboard box now because wooden barrels are too expensive. Thank you for your indulgence."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I've been trying to get your attention for some time. I don't really wish to speak on this Bill but I had asked...I wanted to explain my vote back four bills ago and some sixteen minutes ago my light was on as was, I noticed, two or three other people and we were cut off on debate. Thank you."



Speaker Madigan: "Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise in support of this Conference Committee Report. It seems to me the later it gets the bigger these reports come back. And I would suggest to all of you people especially downstate that we better start passing these things out of here because we're going to end up with them all in one Bill, they're going to ram it down our throats."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lechowicz..."

Ryan: "I would move that you get this out of here and vote aye."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria...the Chair recognizes the Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House. I want you to know that there are many things that people are calling pork that really aren't that are in this Bill. There are things that are vital to the workings and building of Illinois. These are the school programs the things that you are wanting, the things that we have encouraged and I'm not one of those big spenders so I've watched this Bill from the beginning, I urge you to vote yes now because it is getting higher and higher and higher. Let's vote yes on the Capital Development Board."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a lot of things I want to say but instead I'll move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ebbesen, there is no one else seeking recognition so the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, to close the debate."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the few remarks I'd like to make as the House Sponsor of this Bill. I took this Bill as the House Sponsor and I think that the proper posture to keep myself in as Sponsor of this Bill was to defend the



Department's budget which I did to the best of my ability and the other is to defend the House's position which I felt it was my obligation to do in our Committee. It's been a privilege to serve here with the Members of this House and I felt responsible in trying to fight the projects that this House adopted. This is their Bill. They've taken the action they felt was necessary on this Bill in all the steps and all checks and balances that came before this House. It was my privilege to fight for the Members of this House for the projects that they thought were necessary. And I ask you to adopt this Conference Report. I think it does a good job for the Members of this House and I thank you for giving me the privilege to be the House Sponsor."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1936. All those in favor signify by voting aye; all those opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote for one minute."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is no pork barrel, I promise you. You've got to learn the difference between pork and steak and this isn't even cheap steak. It's not any of those canned, or cut or utility cuts. Baby, this is what we call prime beef and you're slicing it up and passing it around. But I'm going to help you because that's the kind of fella I am."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 ayes; 28 nos; 5 voting present. And the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1936. On the Third Supplemental Conference Committee Reports there appears Senate Bill 1524. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like leave of the House to again hear the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1524 and 1956 together."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman requests leave to consider the Conference



Committee Reports together. Leave being granted they shall be considered. Mr. Skinner objects. Mr. Gene Hoffman requests that Mr. Skinner recede from his objection. Mr. Stubblefield, you can proceed on Senate Bill 1524. Mr. Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "On 1524 alone?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, Mr. Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "All right, on 1524 the Second Committee Report, move that the Senate concur in House Amendment 3 and that the House recede from Amendments 5 and 6. Now House Amendment, and the Senate incidentally has approved this Report already, House Amendment 3 is the one that was discussed thoroughly this morning in which it would provide coverage for all counties that were assessing in 1974 below, or above 33-1/3%. That will include, then, an additional some 20 counties, it's the Anderson Amendment and I would move that we approve the Conference Committee's Report."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill as it was amended by the House contained an elimination of the roll back provision of the resource equalizer formula that all of us from the suburban area really wanted. It does not now contain that provision according to the Conference Committee Report. That roll back elimination would not have cost the state a single penny. What has happened here is that the Chicago interests in the RTA has held this concept a hostage to insure suburban votes on what we have to call the sludge bill, that's HB 3518. And that Bill already passed so why would they need to hold it hostage any longer? Because the Governor as everyone of us knows is going to veto that Bill and we're going to be down here voting on an override this fall. That won't work in my opinion because I think that the suburban votes this fall will not be there to sustain a...to override a veto on 3518. In the first place when we're down here this fall the state will be in financial chaos to such an extent that there won't be a



Legislator in this House that won't think ten times before casting a vote to cost this state one more cent. The second reasoning is that 3518 contains an odious unAmerican concept that elevates seniority over ability in determining who will teach our kids and there won't be one suburban Legislator that will vote for that no matter what's in the Bill. In the long run it seems to me the suburban school districts whose only pork barrel is to come down here and ask you for the right to tax ourselves will have been sold out for absolutely nothing. Senate Bill 1524, what's left of it, is however a fair and equitable concept one that straightens out a problem for a number of districts who were assessing to closer to what we all should have been previously and despite the unfair treatment that we've had at the hands of the RTA'ers, I cannot in good conscience and do not oppose the Bill in its final form. And I will vote aye on the Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I agree with the previous speaker. Maybe it is unfortunate the roll back which has been taken out but it is there in another Bill. The point I would make is very simply this, Winnebago County during the recent years has been penalized to the extent of many millions of dollars because they have been doing what most of the counties in the state have not been doing, assessing what they should and what the law provided for it. What we're saying here is that the other 19 counties that would be helped here would also benefit somewhat now. I simply point out to you this one thing, neither Winnebago nor these other counties have come to you for special help in the years that they were getting less money than they really were entitled to but now because of the recent legislation they are in serious trouble and we're asking for some help from you at this time. And I would urge an aye vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage,



JUN 30 1976

274.

Mr. Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, earlier today a distinguished speaker from the other side of the aisle, Representative Beaupre, pointed out that this is the right direction to go in regards to attempting to ameliorate some of the difficulties caused by the passage last Session of House Bill 990. I believe that this Conference Committee Report with this Amendment in, although it does not do everything we want it to do, is in proper form at this time and that the counties that are affected by this deserve this assistance and I would encourage everyone's support of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers. Mr. Deavers."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed... The ayes have it and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield, to close the debate."

Stubblefield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment that has been added to the Bill will cut approximately in half the financial benefits that Winnebago County would have received and that money is spread to other counties. Now I can't be unselfish, or can't be selfish, and ask that all the money come from my county, ignore the problems of other counties. And I'm happy to recommend and urge acceptance of the Bill in that form that will give assistance to other counties. To the Gentleman who spoke on some urban counties that lost the Amendment they had placed on the Bill, I just simply have to tell you Gentleman that I sounded out that Committee; the support was not there on the Committee to include the Amendment and I was assured that the measure would not pass in the Senate if they were left on. And I'd appreciate the support that now you're offering to give and you can count on, I'm sure, the Legislators from my district to stand by you when there's a measure before the House that will accommodate your problem."



I would ask again for a favorable vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1524. All those in favor signify by voting aye; all those opposed by voting no. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, to explain his vote for one minute."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was trying to get the attention of the Chair, I wanted to ask a couple of questions about the Amendments that were going off and the Amendments coming on. I'm going to vote present on this Bill because I simply don't think the state can afford it. It's another one of those things that we're throwing on at the last minute to take care of some problems that are unique to one particular area. And that particular Senator in that particular area doesn't think that there's any other problems in any other part of the State of Illinois. And so I'm just going to vote present on this particular Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote for one minute."

Deuster: "Well, the votes are all up there and there's not much reason to bay to the moon but firstly we're sold out by Senator Hickey; now we're sold out by some of our good friends here who wouldn't stand up and try and help out the suburban area needs for the elimination for the tax roll back. That wouldn't have cost the State of Illinois one penny, it was just a matter of cool politics. It was a good provision. It's been dumped. I encourage all of you in the suburban counties to cast a no vote. It's a shame we've been sold out, but we have, and that's the way it goes in these eleventh hours."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote for one minute."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the problem with Rockford is that it does know its friends from its enemies. Governor Walker is the sole reason Winnebago County has its present financial problems with its school system and its parks and its libraries. Yet the citizens of Winnebago



County voted overwhelmingly against Secretary of State Howlett during the last primary election. I would also comment that I hope that someday the Members of this House who are not from the city of Chicago will realize they have more in common with these others than they do with the Members from the respective city of Chicago. And I say respectively very sincerely. They're the only ones that know how to do anything down here."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, to explain his vote for one minute."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there was nobody that was sold out in this particular Bill. It wasn't too many months ago that we passed legislation here in Springfield which created a situation whereby Winnebago County was the county that was going to be on the losing end. And there was all sorts of expressions thrown around this floor right here as to how this was going to be corrected. Well, it's been corrected now. So you've kept your word; and now we've had... we find there's...another school district throughout the state that find themselves in the same situation. They're going to be helped. This is a good Bill, it's about time it happened."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote for one minute."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has been absolutely without question identified as the Bill on which there were trades made. Those trades reacted to the disadvantage of suburban Cook County and the collar counties as well as, as Mr. Bradley said, other parts of the state. I don't see how anyone regardless of the merits of this Bill or regardless of the fact that the House Sponsor is one of the most honorable men who have ever served here can possibly vote for this Bill. I urge you to vote no."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to explain his vote for one minute."

Daniels: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't speak too often on school matters because I don't profess



to be an expert but I know this, I know that there's been one thing that the people from the collar counties have asked and that's for the elimination of that roll back. But I say to you Members of the suburban collar counties that when the Governor vetoes 3518 and you're back here on your hands and knees then you answer your people back home and tell them that you gave up when we had a chance to eliminate the tax roll back. You answer them, I'm not, I'm voting no on this Bill because the tax roll back elimination isn't there. And I'm proud to vote no."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur, to explain his vote for one minute."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when they mention that this was the tradeoff Bill it certainly has been since it's been in the Senate, come back here, gone back to the Senate, and come back here. Everytime this Bill has come back it was first identified as a Bill that was traded for the RTA; now it comes back here the RTA apparently is dead; now it is traded off for the Hickey School Bills. And I think everybody here should know about this and what you give to Rockford, what you give to Winnebago, is only deserved by the rest of the state. They're not getting it. They're getting the royal you-know-what and they'll continue to get it but I think everybody should know it."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to explain his vote for one minute."

Anderson: "Well, I beg to differ from the last speaker. There are 33 counties in the State of Illinois that are being benefited by this Bill. And also want to say that on this particular Conference Committee vote there were only six signatures. The Republicans refused to sign, all four, because we were mad about the roll back too in the taking out of the one-one hundred and seventy-six. But I'm pragmatic enough of a politician to know that you run with what you can get; there'll be another day coming; we'll get it then."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there are 113 ayes; 32 nos; 10 voting present. And the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1524. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield, who moves that the last Roll Call be used on Senate Bill 1956. Is there leave? Leave being granted the last Roll Call shall be used on Senate Bill 1956. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I was trying to get your attention to reverse my vote to no."

Speaker Madigan: "Miss Geo-Karis wishes to be recorded as no. The Clerk has messages to read into the record. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Conference Committee announcements: 8:30 you're 15 minutes late for a Conference on House Bill 3377. The appointed Members are Byers, Boyle, Bradley, Totten and Ryan. Second Conference Committee on House Bill 3377. At 8:45, Second Conference Committee on House Bill 3392. The appointed Members are Representatives Jaffe, Bradley, E. M. Barnes, Totten and Ryan. That's at 8:45 immediately, Second Conference Committee on House Bill 3392."



Speaker Madigan: "On the Fourth Supplemental Calendar Conference Committee Report appears Senate Bill 1650. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1650, the Committee recommends that the House recede from House Amendment #2 and #4. Senate Amendment... House Amendment #2, recommended that... or added two million dollars plus, for general studies for the City of Chicago and House Amendment #4, was the FEPC Amendment. The First Conference Committee Report recommended that the House recede from the additional money for the City Colleges of Chicago and recommended that the FEPC, Amendment be adopted. The Senate refused to concur and the First Conference Committee Report which recommended that the FEPC Amendment be adopted. The Senate has refused to sign any report that had the FEPC, Amendment in it, stating that the FEPC... provision is presently the law of the State of Illinois and it is not needed in this Bill. The Senate also stated that the amount of money that was in the Bill when it came to the House was all that would be approved by the Governor and that it was foolhardy for us to persist in the addition of the approximately two million dollars for general studies for the City Colleges. The Lieutenant Governor in the first report asked that we have this money in for our senior citizens, he has now receded from that request and the Senate insists that they will not go along with the additional money because the Governor would not accept it and that the amount... the percentages for the various eight category would not be in the correct amount and we have therefore done in my judgment, the best bet that we could do... and that is that the House recede from both the House Amendment and that we accept Senate Bill 1650, as it



came to the House and I sincerely recommend that we go along with Conference Committee Report #2, so that the Junior Colleges of the State of Illinois can continue to operate. I'm informed that the President of the Junior College of the City of Chicago, recommends to all of the Chicago Members, that they vote for this Second Conference Committee Report, that it is the best we can do in this Session. I would appreciate your favorable consideration for Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. During the closing moments of these Sessions, we all become quite enthusiastic about the concerns of our own and those of the districts that we represent. Perhaps at times we become so enthusiastic that we say things that perhaps we will later regret... but we do it in the heat and compassion of the cause that we pursue. And, this is a cause which I think all of us should pursue, first of all, I want to lay to rest the statement that the reason that certain people... not only in the Senate, but in the House... have taken the FEPC Amendment off... is because it's already in the law. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that is not the reason, why the Chancellor... not the President, but the Chancellor of the City Colleges of Chicago is opposed to this particular Amendment. The City of Chicago is the largest urban area of enrollment of people in the Community Colleges anywhere in this State or of anywhere in the country. It's enrollment is composed of 90% black minority students, these students and their teachers feel that with such enrollment, they are entitled to have the proper number of administrators



who are qualified and the proper number of teachers who are qualified. We have tied this Amendment to the expenditure of funds simply because, fair employment practices have long been the policy of the State... have long been the policy of the Democratic Party and yes.... have been a part of plank of the Republican Party. When I stand here before you tonight, and ask that you retain this FEPC Amendment... I'm talking about your Colleges which are the place where more students attend than any other institutions of higher learning combined throughout the State of Illinois. All we are asking that you do is make what is part of the policy of this State, the public policy of the State and of the public policy of the two political parties that we make this a part of this particular Bill. Now, I ask that of you in the name of the people of the City of Chicago who go to those Colleges. It would be a stain on the Democratic Party and a stain on the party across the aisle... to refuse to acknowledge the public policy of the State. Once already we have, by an overwhelming vote... kept the FEPC Amendment on this particular Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the State, I ask you to do it again. The administrators of the College Boards have told me that they favor this... Mr. Shabat, has told me that he favors it... although he has apparently told other things to other people. This is an important Amendment, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Do not vote this Bill into law without it. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Kosinski: "Paul, at what level will health education finally through conference rate it... how much in dollars?"



Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I did not hear the question, I was answering a private question... locally."

Kosinski: "At what rate would health education level in the final conference report?"

Stone: "The final rate was 7.65, which is the rate that the Chancellor of the City Colleges recommended."

Kosinski: "No... no... no... Health Education."

Stone: "Oh, health... was left the same and that.... it's the same that was recommended all the way through Roman, and I..."

Kosinski: "Wasn't it true that it was recommended at the level of 37, while last year it was 25?"

Stone: "No, Sir. This is the first year that they have been rated this way... and health technology.... the rate is 37.01."

Kosinski: "And, last year it was at 25."

Stone: "No, Sir. Last year it was 17.61, as were all other categories, they were all the same...."

Kosinski: "A parity rating and now it has been doubled, is that correct?"

Stone: "Yes, a little more than doubled. It's now 37.01."

Kosinski: "And what were general education services rated at through conference."

Stone: "A general studies are now in at the rate of 7.65 and last year they were of course at the 17.61 rate."

Kosinski: "And parity is 15, plus, is that correct?"

Stone: "I don't know what you mean by the question. I..."

Kosinski: "A parity by law."

Stone: "No, Sir. The law is as we passed it, and we passed it... this year at various rates, they're eight categories and each category has a different rate."

Kosinski: "And, remedial studies, what were they leveled at in conference?"

Stone: "Remedial studies are now at the rate of 14.17."



Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, may I address the report?"

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Stone, began by indicating that the funds for the City of Chicago Colleges have been deleted and I concur. In my area general studies for adult education are one of the most important facets that we can provide. Now, I do not deny the need for increased health education, it is very necessary today. But, at the same time I resent being denied general studies, remedial studies and other areas that are equally important. It is my considered opinion... that we have yielded here to something that is not necessarily good for all areas, it is an imbalance and I don't like imbalances and I for one will not vote for this conference."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to support Mr. Kosinski's position that the remedial program and the other programs are being sacrificed for highly technical programs and at the citizens of Chicago. In the heart land... has to have general education, adult education, you have persons coming from... you have emigrants and you have migrants, who come to Chicago and need this education as adults. In order to keep our work level up to the point where they can get off public assistance and these are the people that you are sacrificing for some highly skilled people. They all need it, let's everybody sacrifice alike, not make the poor take the biggest burden... so I'm asking not to approve this report."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Well, thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House. With all deference to the Sponsor of this Bill and I'm sorry it's not very often that I get emotional about an issue, Mr. Speaker. But, I'm getting damn sick and tired of listening to report after report, tell us what the Senate will and will not go along with. We've been listening at this bull crap all day on this particular Bill, the Senate has walked all over the wishes of this House and I don't think we ought to be a party to it... this is not compromise, this is agitation... that Senate portion of that Committee has just completely ignored the wishes of this House. Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, when this Bill was heard in Committee there were five hundred people who came down from Chicago to indicate their support for the Amendment that was put on this Bill relating to the increase in rates for general studies. Mr. Speaker, on no later than Saturday night, I had the occasion to give the commencement address for the graduation exercise at the St. Mary's Adult Education Center. Three hundred graduates and to show you the support for that program... over two thousand people showed up to see those three hundred graduates receive their diplomas. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been at... I don't know how many commencement exercises for high school graduates but I can tell you that the expression on the faces of these people who range in age from 21, up to 60, when they finally receive a high school diploma after working so long and so hard at it, this is a slap in the face and I don't give a damn if we have to have four or five or ten Conference Committee Reports to make sure that the Senate finally gets the message that we will not be put down... if the people want it, we'll give it to them."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from



Lake, Mr. Deuster."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Deuster: "Representative Stone, do I understand... the basic Bill was a Bill to provide funds for distribution all over the State of Illinois, to all the Community Colleges is that correct?"

Stone: "Yes, Sir." "

Deuster: "And, the one House Amendment that's arousing a certain amount of excitement was one that provides additional funds for all the State of Illinois or for one particular area, or what was that?"

Stone: "Well, it was primarily for one particular area, the City of Chicago and it was for the classification of general studies, the Blue Ribbon Committee which recommended that we go to the eight classification... put general studies as the classification with the least priority. And, the reason that they did that, is because of the nature of course that were taught in general study. They felt that the courses taught in general study were not as important as some of the other courses. Now, I would like to read to you a list of some of the courses that the Blue Ribbon Committee, which was concurred in by the Junior College Board and by the Board of Higher Education, and they said that the following were not as important as finance and the technical courses which would teach people more important things. These are the courses that are rated as less important. Home auto mechanic, ladies know your car, now these are the type courses, investing in stocks, home appliance repair, beginning sewing, spring flowers, personal defense, wardrobe planning coordination and personal finance. And, others of this nature... the people that are involved in the Junior College Program



JUN 30 1976

286.

that these types of programs are not as important as those that are teaching our young people at trade, avocation, at something that will assist them in making a living. Therefore, they put them at the lowest rate on the scale of reimbursement and that is what some of the Gentlemen are complaining about here... and that is the best judgment of those who are best informed in the field has said that we should do and we've been unable to keep the extra money in the Bill for this sort of study. Now, I would be in favor of this if we had money, Mr. Deuster, but we just don't have it and assuming that we were able to keep it in the Bill, I have been informed that the Governor would be forced to veto the additional money because we are, as you know short of money in the State of Illinois and this is the way that the Junior College people have said that in their considered judgment, this is the way we should spend the money that is available to us."

Deuster: "I didn't expect such an eloquent and elaborate answer but I appreciate it, the second question that I have is that there is some confusion, I think with the respect to what the position of the Chicago Community College administration is.... do you have any ideas of what the leaders of that College... what they feel are they generally in concurrence with the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Committee, or where are they..."

Stone: "They are as all administrators are, would be pleased to have the extra money. I have been informed that they have all... the leaders of the Chicago contingent here and ask that we go along with the recommendation of this Second Conference Committee Report, because that is the best that we can do with what we have available."

Deuster: "Thank you, very much."



JUN 30 1976

287.

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I sometimes think your peripheral vision is better than your straight ahead look but, I just assumed that you didn't see me standing here. Will the Sponsor yield? Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Washington..."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Washington: "Did the Chancellor Shabat, Mr. Stone... indicate his impression or attitude toward the FEPC Amendment?"

Stone: "I'm sorry, I didn't understand your question."

Washington: "Did Chancellor Shabat, express himself on the FEPC Amendment?"

Stone: "To my knowledge, I have no information on that question."

Washington: "Did he indicate to you any preference or attitude about the remedial reading section, the remedial section."

Stone: "Not to me, Sir. No..."

Washington: "Did Oscar Shabat, testify as to the FEPC or the remedial aspect in Committee?"

Stone: "I am sure that he expressed no opinion as to the FEPC aspects of the Amendment. The other, I don't recall that he did."

Washington: "But, he did indicate to you by telephone, I imagine that he wanted to support this Conference Report."

Stone: "Not to me, Sir, but I have been informed by others here that he has informed them that he felt that this was the best that we could do and that we should accept it."

Washington: "Did any of the Senators in Conference



Committee... support the FEPC Amendment?"

Stone: "Yes, Sir. Well, all of the Senators, well not all but those that signed the first report, supported the FEPC Amendment, they were unable to get it through the Senate and since they were unable to, they came up with this suggested Second Conference Committee Report... I have just now been informed that it passed the Senate 49 to 0, and...."

Washington: "Well, I don't want to demean your position Representative Stone, you know the high esteem that I hold for you. But, I wonder if you would transmit Mr. Shabat a message for me and I hope, some Members of this House...to the affect that, he has a lot of nerve not pushing as strong as he possibly could... for the machinery to help him clean up the racist operation which he's running in the City of Chicago. Forty-two millions of dollars from this State go into that combine, every year... approximately. Yet, that collection of councils has the worst record of discrimination in the faculty area and in administrative area of any other university or college complex, institution or operation in this State. We have to put the fault right on his doorstep, because he's been there since time immemorial. And, it seems to me... that he would be very much concerned about trying to wipe it out, but all he seems to want is the money. He doesn't seem to want to shoulder the public policy responsibility that this General Assembly has placed upon his shoulders. So, we put this Amendment in here... and it simply said, that no funds should be spent in violation of FEPC laws, very clear, very concise. Evidently he's talking out of two sides of his mouth for he told one Representative by phone today that he supports it, he told another that he didn't care if he lost all the money in



JUN 30 1976

289.

the remedial program, he could not buy the FEPC platform. I'm sure that he didn't tell you that Mr. Stone, cause you would have put him in his place. I'm positive you would have, but I think he slapped this House in the mouth and I think he's insulting the General Assembly by having the audacity of running a racist institution and then fighting the very machinery which would help up... help him straighten it out. I think we should send this Bill back to a Conference Committee #3, 4, 5, 6, somebody should get him the message, perhaps he should get on a plane and come down here and face up to this thing.... but we have got to make it clear to the Community Colleges of the City of Chicago, that we're no longer going to tolerate their ambivalence... taking forty some odd million dollars a year from the coffers of our State and refuse to live up to the public policies of the State. I don't think that we have ever been confronted with a more clear cut violation... violation if you will, I implore you... do not approve of this Conference Report. Mr. Shabat needs a lesson."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I renew my motion that I... pardon me, not my motion, my point of Parliamentary Inquiry... that I addressed to the Chair before. What is the disposition of this Bill in the event of failure to adopt the Second Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: "It is my understanding, Mr. Meyer, that matter is still under advisement with the Parliamentarian... that's why I was informed by the previous speaker..."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I spoke to the Parliamentarian and you have spoken to the Parliamentarian and we have been advised to his informal opinion and I think.... Mr. Speaker, this is business, the affairs of eleven million



people are in our hands... and I think it's time that we begin to address these problems seriously. Now, you know and I know, he said that these Bills are dead and I think the time is for the Chair to bite the bullet and tell the Membership and make a ruling. And, I renew my request."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Meyer, your request is noted and I told you the previous speaker..."

Meyer: "By the way, what time is it?"

Speaker Madigan: "... that matter... according to my watch it is 9:10."

Meyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "That matter is still under advisement. And, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Meyer indicated that the Bills could be dead. I would suggest to this General Assembly... and this House of Representatives that no Bill is dead until we leave here, that every Bill and every need of the people of Illinois can be addressed as long as we're willing to stay here and work. And, I would suggest... point of personal privilege, to thank Representative DiPrima, who gave me the opportunity to have the experience of walking in the moccasins of the Speaker. I realize how difficult it is to run this House and how sincerely we must work towards a deadline, and I realize the difficulties that Representative... on the other side of the aisle have been raising, maybe just to delay this move procedure of the House, the trap of falling into my colleague from the Northside of the City of Chicago, and merely delaying the procedures of the House for partisan gains. But some issues rise above politics and I would suggest to the



Members of this General Assembly that this issue as outlined by Representative Madison, Representative Washington and I believe contained in Representative Catania's Amendment, moves well beyond the mere needs to adjourn on time. I would suggest that the Blue Ribbon Panel will call everybody, but there is a very constricted impression about education. Education is something that is not merely to get a job... education is to live and many of the senior citizens, many of the community programs, many of the outreach programs would be contained in this Amendment that is now being deleted by Conference Committee Report 2, are essential. They are critical to restore our faith in the people in Chicago, that education is merely not a passport to a job but is really a ticket to living. And, I would suggest to Representative Peters, that he join with me... in suggesting that we cannot move too hastily in protecting the rights to all the people to have an equal opportunity. Whether they are rich or poor, whether those people have had the opportunity to be down here and watch the Legislature in progress... I would suggest to you that we would all do ourselves proud in sending this Conference Committee Report back and asking for a new Conference Committee and a real consideration of these very critical points."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm going to ignore those partisan remarks that the previous Gentleman made, frankly I don't feel so good about Members on the other side of the aisle making all those remarks about my colleague, Representative Waddell, who sits behind me. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like at this point to follow up somewhat... on a Parliamentary



inquiry which Representative Meyer make. The hour is now 9:15, and Rule 68, is still in effect and I would like to make a point, Mr. Speaker, that as a practical matter now... any further Conference Committee Reports which are passed out to us on a supplemental Calendar, will have to wait three hours... take us beyond the hour of midnight, and therefore require a three-fifths vote to become effective this year.... or it would take 107 votes to suspend Rule 68."

Speaker Madigan: "You have raised a point of inquiry?"

Telcser: "It's not a point of inquiry, Sir.... it's simply I'm saying a matter of fact."

Speaker Madigan: "In your opinion. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the previous question on the debate that was going on before we got into what time we had to quit tonight. I move the previous question on the debate that was going on before."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes' have it and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, to close the debate."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have listened very attentively to everyone who has spoken. I will say... can you hear me?"

Speaker Madigan: "Would you raise Mr. Stone... proceed, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "I have been very impressed with the sincerity of every person who spoke on this matter. Representative Mann and Representative Washington could not be more sincere in what they have said, I would say that they probably couldn't be right in what they have said. I have served here a long time, it seems to me that Re-



representative Mann, I have listened to him by the hour... speak in behalf of the downtrodden and those who could not take care of themselves, on occasion I've got mighty tired of it but, you know, I'm thankful for him and for people like him who are here, that will have the nerve to stand up and say what needs to be said for those people. I just wish, Representative Mann, that I could get your Amendment on here but I can't. I wish that I could answer all the question that Representative Washington has raised. I wish that I could call upon Chancellor Shabat, and say 'take care of those problems because they are pressing and they need to be taken care of' but I can't do that either, Ladies and Gentlemen. But I am asking you to vote 'yes' on this Second Conference Committee Report, it's my considered judgment that if we had sixteen more Conference Committees, I couldn't do any better and I apologize to you... but I do think that the time comes that we have to sorta' close up the books on what we can do this year... and take it and then start out and try to do better next year. And, I'm sorry that I... in this respect, I'm sorry that I won't be here to help you do better next year. There is a lot that needs to be done, we can't do it all in one Session and as much as I would like to be able to help you... knock some sense in some peoples heads... we just can't do it. You know, the... a trip around the world starts with the first step, maybe we have taken not the first step but maybe we have taken a big step this year. I hope so, at least I've heard what you've said and I hope that others on up the pike have heard what you have said, I do hope that we can get the necessary votes to pass the Second Conference Committee Report. If I can help you next year I'll be glad to come down and do it. Thank you, very much."



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

Mann: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned in debate and while I appreciate the favorable frame of reference, I do differ with the Gentleman when he characterizes what the State care is a pressing problem. The rights of 90% of the minority students in the Chicago Community Junior Colleges, can hardly be regarded as pressing and neither can the rights of the citizens who are in the golden age category. We're not looking for oratorical tokenism, we're looking for equal rights and equal opportunities in the year 1976, in the State of Illinois and I would suggest to the Gentleman that he can do a lot for this... this Session, by merely refusing to go along with the Conference Committee Report, that by his own admission, is neanderthal in nature. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1650? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan, to explain his vote."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let's forget all the issues and get down to what we're voting on. Let's talk sense... tax sense, we're talking about higher education Junior College vote, we do not have sufficient money for elementary and secondary education. We do not owe everyone a Junior College education, well what are they doing here now?... they're downgrading... all they're doing is downgrading such programs as spring flowers, wardrobes,



auto mechanics and courses like that which are usually taken by adults, now if we could afford these programs that's fine... but we can't afford to educate our children properly... what are we going to cut? Obviously we've got to cut in this program, now let's give this grand old man a higher education, Representative Paul Stone, has been at it many years, this is his last Bill he knows what he's talking about, this is a Conference Committee 2 Report... let's pass this Bill, get a bunch of greenies on there and get on with our business."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, to explain his vote."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We in the First District, as most of you know, get very little of this money, but what we do get from the ICB is opposition to innovative ideas that would allow us to complete the Illinois Community College System and what we get from ICCB, is an extension of the charge back levy with the incredible condition that we hold an annexation referendum... when a referendum will never pass in our district and the only accomplishment will be the total waste of the taxpayers' money to conduct the election. What we get from ICCB, is the most stupid thinking... unbelievable stupid thinking on how to complete the system and I for one, will vote against anything that they want in the General Assembly until they come their senses on this issue and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, to explain his vote for one minute."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've been here ten years and the Sponsor of this Bill indicated his sympathy, his empathy and his inability to get the FEPC Amendment on in the Senate, that sounds like a broken record. We've



worked for many years finally to get the FEPC and we've got it and now we refuse to implement it and I disagree with the idea that we can't do anything about it. Those of us from Chicago, where we have four Community Colleges which educate over half of the students under that program... are sick and tired of Mr. Shabat, being a dictator, spending the amounts of money that he's spending and I should say mis-spending. And if we don't stop it now, what we're asking for is a simple Amendment which we put on, which this House accepted and I don't understand why it can't be put on in the Senate and I would ask our colleagues to go along with us and let's get that Amendment on there. We keep talking about it can't be done... next year... next year, I've been here ten years and I've heard that refrain and I'm getting damn sick and tired of it. Now, I would reveal that we tried to conduct government here as it should be conducted and I think that we... in order to do that, we work with the downstate people, the people in the central part of the State and those of us in Chicago are concerned about those poor Community Colleges and I can guarantee you that we've used everything but a two by four to try to get into the man who runs them... some sense and he's been down here lobbying around the clock and apparently has succeeded. I would suggest that we fail to amend this... to approve of this Bill and let us go back to the Senate and those of you who say that it can't be done... and what will happen, will ever happens... let it happen. We are down here to conduct government and I would suggest that unless we vote against this Bill, we're not conducting it."

Speaker Madigan: "Would Mr. Giorgi, come to the Speaker's podium and the Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote."



Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, I agree whole heartily with Representative Mann, the Chairman of the Higher Education Committee, this is a terrible report both from the point of view of fair play, justice, constitutionality and philosophy of education. These general education courses offer just as exactly what these people in their area need, Heaven knows every week when I drive back and forth to Springfield, I wish that the schools in my day had been enlightened enough to offer a course on 'Ladies, look under the hood of your car', or whatever you said it was. That basic survivor course in today's world, it's important..."

Speaker Madigan: "Giorgi, in the Chair."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I would like to ask a verification of this Roll Call, because I see some green lights there of people who are not on the floor."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I agree completely with Representative Kosinski, that we ought to refuse to approve this Conference Committee Report and return to the bargaining table and work it out the best way that we can. The Senate has been absolutely arrogant in what they have done to us. It was our Appropriations Committee that sat here on this House floor surrounded by hundreds of people in the galleries who had come down, they had got up at 5 o'clock in the morning to ride school buses down here to let us know how important these remedial developmental studies programs are to them. Now, some of these programs are important to senior citizens, it's true and whether you think we ought to have those or not is one question but the other question is whether you think we ought to extend the opportunity to get



general equivalency diplomas to the kind of people that Representative Madison was talking about before... the people ranging in age from 21 to 60, who have gone back to get their high school diplomas so that they can get a job and get off of Public Aid. For heavens sakes that's what we're talking about here, please vote 'no', so we can go back to the bargaining table and work out a reasonable compromise. What's...what's it all about."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative James Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in debate and I think you ought to rule me out of order."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, it is amazing, when we sit and ask and say to you what we need in the area... we always get nothing but advice. People tell us about taking off around the world, it's only one difference... all trips start with one step, that's the problem... we do the walking and the others go by jet, that's the inequity of the situation. You talk to us about the fact that you want to do something about the problem, we tell you what we need and you turn a deaf ear. If we talked about moving... if we talked about doing something a little different, like taking the tax in or out of Springfield, and moving it up to Chicago where half of the people live... where more than half of the money is collected, we don't hear about nothing but what the State... what the County of Sangamon, needs. We respond to all of your needs, we respond to every time you've cried, we give you everything you want... you cannot nail morality to a cross of dollars and that's exactly what you're doing tonight. You're saying that



the dollars are more important than morality. Ladies and Gentlemen, you can't do it... let us go back and at least take our shot, we've got to do something in this area and we ask and we beg for your help... and now we even plead for your help and don't want to come back with nothing but promises of... come see us next year."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative John Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard a lot tonight about how the Community Colleges serve the people and it's a people's program I would like to point out some people's statistics about where we are tonight... as the Bill came to the House from the Senate earlier this year, it was programmed to serve of one hundred, sixty-nine thousand and four hundred people. As the Bill stands now, the House versions will accomodate... if we go back into conference and go the way that the people are arguing against these Amendments... want us to go, we will wind up with a hundred and sixty-six thousand, two hundred people being served. This is three thousand two hundred fewer students. If we adopt this Conference Committee Report, tonight... in other words, we're going to serve three thousand, two hundred students more than if we don't so if we're really interested in a people's program, we should adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Epton, to explain his vote."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sorry that I was attending a Conference Committee and I wasn't privy to some of the discussion that went on. I'm particularly sorry because this is a personal situation, as far as I'm concerned. My mother was



born in Europe, she didn't have much of an opportunity to get an education and when she came to this country, most of her time was spent raising her family. Fortunately because of situations like this, my mother was able to go to school in the afternoon and in the evening and at sixty-five years old, my mother finally learned how to read and to write and to sign her name. My mother wasn't ashamed any longer to go into a restaurant and order her food. I think that this is something that you should consider, I appreciate the fact that there are many of you who may not have had this problem facing you while you were growing up, but there are still many in our communities... not only in Chicago, but in all of the suburban communities in the State that do need the help of these Community Colleges. What we are asking for... is one final attempt to have this Conference Committee revise their attitudes and hopefully find some of those additional funds for those senior citizens who have given us so very much and ask for so very little. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Emil Jones, to explain his vote."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'll be very brief... because it doesn't look like this Conference Committee Report will receive the necessary 89 votes. But, what I would suggest to you Mr. Speaker, as I look at the Conference Committee Report #1 and #2, is that you appoint someone on that Conference Committee from Appropriations II, who heard this Bill and would be in there fighting for some of the needs of some of the people of the City of Chicago. As I look at this report, you have the Sponsor of the Bill and you have two other Democratic Members who were not Members of the Appropriations Committee... who do



not know what is going on and I would suggest to you Mr. Speaker, do like they do on the other side of the aisle... put some of the Appropriation Members on these Committees."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "I yield, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Davis, to explain his vote."

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

Failure to crowd against the inequity is the inequity itself. I cannot sit here without the opportunity at least to say... I agree with Representative Mann, I agree wholeheartly with Representative Washington and all of those who spoke against this report. More than five hundred people as it has been stated from my district, came down here and they thought they had it all settled and now here we come with two point one million dollars being cut out of their general studies. How in the world are we ever going to be able to reduce the welfare rolls and that sort of thing... when you take the only opportunity the people will have to learn... take gainful employment away from them. It would seem to me that instead of cutting this... we would be trying to find someway, if possible, to even add more. How in the name of God can we point to others about one flair of tactics when here our Community Colleges go along with a proposition to cut the fair employment practice Bill out of their agenda. It would seem to me that there ought to be leaders in the fields of fair employment practice. I'm so surprised, I'm so sorry that this has happened but at least... we can go in... reject this Conference Committee and perhaps we can get a compromise out of it and that's what we ought to get and for that reason, I'm voting 'no'."



JUN 30 1976

302.

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A great President, Lyndon Johnson, popularized the truism, 'the way to get along is to go along' and in this particular instance, we share the concern of those of you who have felt that you have been neglected and I want to say to you that in the 54th district, each of the Community Colleges there is a jewel, a source of joy and pride to all of us who rejoice with the dedicated people who lead the Community Colleges but, we recognize that there comes a time when we got the maximum that we can get. In this instance we need for... we deserve more for our Community Colleges but we're afraid to risk it to one more Conference... things could go the other way, I haven't often waxed lyrical in the praise in the Representative from Moultrie County, but I have the gut reaction in this instance, he's right and on that faith I'm casting a green vote and urge as many as you can... will join me in casting a green vote we must not let this opportunity to be frittered away until the 4th of July."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stone, to explain his vote."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Again, I don't know what to say to you except that in my humble judgment this is the best that we can do for you... I agree with much of what has been said, I believe that we shouldn't throw out the baby with the bath water... and I'm sincerely afraid that that's what we'll be doing if we don't pass this. I see people working against it that I'm convinced will... that are working against their best interest... if this money is added that the people from the City Colleges of Chicago are asking



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that we put in, if that is put in... the Bill and the money is not raised and I assure you that the money that is allotted to the Junior Colleges cannot be increased and if it isn't, we will be educating twelve hundred fewer students in the State of Illinois than you would be if we passed this Second Conference Committee Report. I believe sincerely that if you do not pass it, you're making a mistake... not only for those people from downstate but, the people from the City of Chicago. And, I earnestly solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm recorded as 'aye', but I have a feeling on verification some are going to turn their vote to 'no' and now it's becoming most interesting to me at this late stage of the Session... how many goodies we're going to have on that christmas tree Bill, so I'm going to change my vote 'no' and find out how many ornaments we're going to have on that final Bill that everybody is going to end up voting for. So, I'll change to 'no' now."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? For what purpose does the Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, arise?"

Dyer: "I just wanted to remind the Speaker, that I would like to request a verification and I might say to the Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, it might save a lot of time... I've counted the names of fourteen people who have green lights... and who are not here and it would save a lot of time if you'll just take those lights off and the Speaker can announce this thing's failed and we can go on."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, on a point of personal privilege."



Madison: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and I appreciate the Lady from Cook, Miss Catania, using my name in debate because it gives me a chance for a point of personal privilege. It appears to me Mr. Speaker, and I indicated before that I have the highest regard for Representative Stone, but Representative Stone, through no fault of his own has been sorely misinformed. He has been constantly misinformed by Dr. Shabat, and by other persons who want this Bill to pass. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. Let me just tell you what happened in Appropriations Committee, first attempt to put this money in, was to transfer it out of another category... it would have not added new money, that was Representative Kosinski's Amendment. That Amendment failed because Dr. Shabat, said that he would rather it not be transferred...."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, arise?"

Kane: "I think the Gentleman was recognized for a point of personal privilege and he's debating the Bill and he has already spoken once."

Speaker Madigan: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I will bring my remarks to a close. The fact is, that there has been a lot of conversation about this money going to Community Colleges... the fact is, this money just happens to flow through the Community Colleges. We're talking about two million dollars for people to get a high school diploma, the Community College students don't benefit from this.... people who want to get off of welfare and get a high school diploma, benefit from this money... now, I beg of you, don't do this to us, give us the lousy two million dollars so that we can do it. Thank you,



Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Stone, do you request a poll of the absentees?"

Stone: "I'm not going to do a God damn thing, I'm going to let Madison, take care of it."

Speaker Madigan: "Do you request a poll of the absentees... The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do... I hope that we get enough votes, if we don't then I will say that those who have been fighting it will lose more than I will. I have no students that... in any Junior College... I believe I've done the best that I can... I am convinced that those of you who... most of you who are voting 'no', are making a mistake... those that are voting 'present' are... ought to make up their mind and..."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stone, we will proceed with the poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Byers, Campbell, Capuzi, Craig, Fleck, Gene Hoffman, McPartlin, Randolph, Rose, Satterthwaite, Williams, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question there are 86 'ayes', 64 'no', 15 voting 'present' and the House does not adopt... for what purpose does the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, arise?"

McMaster: "Will you change me from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. McMaster, as 'aye'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, arise?"

Skinner: "Well, I think we ought to get all the gripes on the table. I'm voting 'present' because I don't believe that special equalization portion of the Junior College formula should double every two years, thus benefiting



those Junior Colleges that do not charge any tuition. My Junior College has the highest tuition of the State of Illinois, to the best of my knowledge, at fifteen dollars per credit hour and if it was '0', like some of the Junior Colleges in Southern Illinois... we would also look poor according... and be able to qualify for a boodle of money into the special equalization formula."

Speaker Madigan: "On this question there are 87 'ayes', 64 'no' and the House does not adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1650. On the order of the Third Supplemental Calendar Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2736, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz. Mr. Katz, are you ready to call this Bill? You Gentleman are not ready? Fine... for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, arise? James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, on the previous Bill, did you indicate that there was a call for another Conference Committee?"

Speaker Madigan: "I stated that the motion to adopt the Conference Committee Report lost."

Houlihan: "I understand that Representative Shea, pointed out to me very graphically that the call for a subsequent Conference Committee was automatic.... no?"

Speaker Madigan: "That matter is still under advisement and the Chair recognizes Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You'll recall that with regards to House Bill 2736, that Mr. Friedrich, had raised some question with regard to it... we have been discussing the matter and we have resolved a way to solve the problem and that would be to, reject the Conference Committee Report to request another Conference Committee and that Conference Committee can come out with a report that meets the



points that have been raised by the distinguished Gentleman, who had raised their voices in debate. So, I would move to reject the Conference Committee Report and to ask that another Conference Committee be appointed with regard to House Bill 2736."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House... Mr. Katz."

Katz: "That the House not adopt the First Conference...."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Katz, moves that the House do not adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2736. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed... the 'ayes' have it and the House does not adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2736. On the order of Conference Committee Reports, Second Supplemental Calendar appears Senate Bill 1621. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond... for what purpose does the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland, arise?"

Friedland: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The hour being after 9 P.M., I move pursuant to Rule 68, that all Bills in Conference Committee be Tabled."

Speaker Madigan: "You're not recognized for that purpose, Mr. Friedland. Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to bring before you again this Second Conference Committee Report concerning Senate Bill 1621. I would like to point out that as a Freshman I'm sure you know that I have nothing whatsoever to do with the appointments to Committee, I felt an honor to be appointed myself. And, as the freshman Legislator, I suppose that I must have drawn the short straw and got this particular non controversial Bill. And, I find myself standing



JUN 30 1976

308.

in a very well defined battle line of long standing so I'll try to dodge bullets from both sides and proceed with this Bill to provide funding for this..."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and I'd like to be heard on this point. I raised the point previously that a Conference Committee that has been appointed was subsequently aborted by removing one Member with no authorization and allowing another Member to file a Conference Committee Report without having been formally appointed by the Speaker of the House to that Conference Committee. Eliminating that one vote would result in a Conference Committee Report that does not have a majority voting in favor of the Conference Committee Report so obviously is invalid. Now when I raised this point the temporary Speaker who was not you, stated that an amended appointment notice has been sent to the Senate. I would hesitate to say that he knowingly misled me and this House but upon checking the Senate I learned that no amendment notice had been sent over to the Senate. I checked twice and then went so far as to ask them that when they received it would they please send me a copy which has not been done yet. I also asked the Gentleman whether the Amendment had been sent before the Conference Committee acted, he replied in the affirmative. Again, this turns out to be untrue. So I think my point is valid, the Conference Committee was invalidly, illegally, improperly appointed and so the vote in the Conference Committee should be nullified. The Report of the Conference Committee obviously cannot stand the scrutiny of this House and I think that this Bill should be declared dead."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, could we please have some order in the Chambers it's quit difficult to hear the Sponsor of this Bill and the debate that's going on."



Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman's point is well taken. Will the Membership please give us your attention to the debate. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Gerald Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, maybe I can shed some light on the question brought up by Mr. Collins. We have made every effort in our office in appointing Committees and Members of the Committee, we have made every effort as Mr. Collins well knows being here longer than I have been here, that the Members have been notified when the meetings will be held, what time and where. They've been posted on the bulletin board outside for the public to attend if they so wish and many public members have...the public has decided that they wanted to be there and they have been there. If there has been some mixup in this one particular item that he brings...calls to our attention then I will take the blame for that mixup. Let me say this to you though, Mr. Collins, that the Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1621, Mr. Domico was assigned to that Second Conference Committee. Now I have taken a look at the message sent from the Clerk's office to the Senate and I believe possibly that there may have been some mixup at that time. But the notice is posted, the notice is sent to the Members, the Conference Committee did meet with Mr. Domico on it and Mr. Domico did sign the Conference Report. And I think that every obligation that the House had to meet in legalizing this Conference Report, and I think it is valid. It should be adopted. It certainly should not be adopted because Mr. Domico was not assigned to it because he certainly was. He certainly was. It was posted he was a Member of that Conference. We have made every effort. I have never as long as I've been here....I, for the first time, I sat in a Conference Committee with nine other Members, five from both Houses, sat down at the table the day before yesterday at that First Conference Committee. I have sat at more Conference Committees than I ever thought that I would sit at. You have been notified.



The Members have been notified. We've called the attention to the Members from the Clerk's desk asking him to be at certain specific places so that we could go ahead and work and do the business of the House. I think that Mr. Domico belonged on that Conference Committee and his signature is valid and I think we should go ahead and vote 1621 up or down on the merits of 1621 as that Conference Committee was assigned. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Collins has not cited a rule that has been violated under his point of order and I daresay there's no rule he can find that's been violated. Having not cited a rule that has been violated, Mr. Speaker, I would request that you move...you rule that his motion is out of...his point of order is out of order."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich, your point is well taken. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, arise?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't attempt to cite a rule that has been violated. I think the law in the Constitution of this state has been violated by these actions. Now, Mr. Bradley is willing to take all of the..."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, if the Constitution has been violated, cite that section that's been violated. You just can't get up here on the floor of the House and say something's been violated and raise the point of order because it's your favorite topic. Cite the section of the Constitution so that you have a valid point of order, but you don't have one and you know it."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the motion before the House is the adoption of the Conference Committee Report and on that motion the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "I want to inform you right now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not arising



311.

on that motion, I'm arising to let this Body know now once again in the waning hours of this Session that any Member's got the right to get up and debate any subject and ask any questions of that Chair that he wants and he's got the right to have an answer. Representative Collins is very interested in this Bill and has been for many, many years. What his reasons are, that's not the point, he's got a valid question on this Conference Committee and you haven't answered it and he shouldn't be shut off. He should be given an answer of some kind."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes....Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Maybe there isn't a rule covering this thing but by golly there should be some principles they do arise on occasion in this House by the governing...I shouldn't say governing, by the Majority Party and I think that we ought to stick to something here. If a Conference Committee were appointed it should have been kept that way. But things like that, it might be of a minor nature to most of us but it's important to Representative Collins. And if things of a minor nature to most of us are happening now they're going to become more major and major as time goes on tonight and until January the 10th or August the 3rd whenever you can figure out a way to get out of here."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise because I also represent the 29th District from which Mr. Barnes represents and this is an affront to the 29th District to have Mr. Barnes treated in this manner. I'm also appalled when the Democratic Party comes to my District claims to be such a great champion of black causes and then I find that my distinguished colleague is so mistreated and I find that the other colleague I have, the distinguished attorney Ray Ewell, is not on any of these Conference Committees. And I wonder if the Democratic Party is practicing benign neglect



or something more serious. Why don't they put the best black minds on this Committee? The Republican Party puts the most experienced men they have; and on the Democratic side some of the most experienced men they have are black. They do not put the most experienced men they have on that side of the aisle. And I wonder why. And yet they come out time and time again and claim to be the champion of the black people. I challenge the Leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle to show their dedication to black people by putting these competent black men on these important committees instead of putting another freshman who has less seniority than I have."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Conference Committee Report is no better at 10 o'clock than it was at 8 o'clock. And the questions that Representative Collins have raised about the appointment of committee members is certainly one that has a lot of justification. As a Member of that Conference Committee that did not sign the Report, I can't remember the Member in dispute even attending the Conference Committee. But let me point out to the Members of this General Assembly that this budget has rather a curious history since its introduction. It is the only one, only budget that I can recall, that has a history like this. The budget request was 2.102 million. The introduction was 2.102 million. The Senate action was 2.102 million. The House action was 2.102 million. And it wasn't until we got into the Senate...Second Conference Committee that additional things started to happen. Now I'm kind of leery of what may happen if we put this into 1932 where we go to a Third Conference Committee but I'll tell you at 2.226 million as this Bill sits now it's certainly doesn't deserve any aye vote in this General Assembly and it should be defeated. And I respectfully request a no vote on the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2 on Senate Bill



1621."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I thought Representative Totten was out of order, that wasn't the motion in front. I think that the Sponsor of the Bill should be called to explain the Conference Committee Report and we should move for adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed... The ayes have it. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, to close the debate."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since it was requested, I will give you a very brief description of what this Conference Committee Report does entail. Number one, that the House recede from House Amendment #2. And number two, that the appropriation...\$125,000 for ethnic art organizations. Actually the Arts Council, of course, supports art throughout the state and it is not part of our nuts and bolts part of government but it is something that much the same as many of our other programs that we support dealing with our heritage, history and culture. So I would urge you to support me in this move to accept the Committee Report #2."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1621. All those in favor signify by voting aye; all those opposed by voting no. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote for one minute."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, just last night I remember you and the Majority Leader standing on the floor and yelling for fairness. It's



obvious that things change when you assume the Chair. It's a sad state of affairs when you get that gavel in your hands and you change your spots like a leopard right away. And the only thing that made you look good was the Majority Leader's treatment of me earlier. But to vote for this Bill which is an obvious slap at some Members on your own side of the aisle I think is a travesty. To vote for this Bill which has been loaded with pork all these years and is now a \$125,000 higher than it left this House, higher than it was requested originally, I think is sinful. In these days of financial austerity we should look to our own house and this would be a great place to make a start. Again, I protest your unfairness, I would like to record my dissent in your earlier rulings and in the rulings of the Majority Leader. I'm glad that next year we'll be able to treat you in the same manner."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. James Houlihan, to explain his vote for one minute."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment which so many of you have trouble with may raise a great deal of difficulty. But let me suggest to you that the power defined is the power to make grants. And you can define, Representative Peters, who is included in minorities and who is included in ethnic. If there are some people who feel so discriminated against, who are so insecure in their American heritage that they feel they must include this Amendment, let it go on. But I suggest to you that the Arts Council has been a wonderful program, has brought art to the people, art to all of the communities in Illinois, and deserve an aye vote from every Representative in this House."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld, to explain his vote."

Hirschfeld: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, in six years down here I have never failed to vote for the Illinois Arts Council but I think that the point raised by Representative Collins are genuine and I don't think they are raised because of his almost antagonistic



attitude toward the Arts Council. I would say this that I think that the Chair's ruling on the point raised by Representative Collins is the first time in two years, the last two years, that I would say we miss Robert Blair."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe, to explain his vote for one minute."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Conference Committee Report. The whole program is a waste of the taxpayer's money. And waste two million more dollars of the taxpayer's money, I see what they do with the money in Chicago, they go around and paint the viaducts, underneath the railroad viaducts, in downtown Chicago on the lower level of Wacker Drive. This is an absolute waste of the taxpayer's money at a time when we haven't got any money at all to waste. Well, people are talking about raising taxes and scrounging around trying to run our schools, they have to close our schools two weeks early. And we can give these people two-and-a-half million dollars to go around and paint fireplugs and viaducts on the lower level of Wacker Drive is absolutely crazy. And the people back home, if they knew we were doing it, none of us would get reelected. This is a complete waste of money. It's a chance to save the taxpayers two-and-a-half million dollars. Vote no and kill the whole program."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote for one minute."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a very different reason for voting present on this Bill. I don't have anything against the Illinois Arts Council but I cannot participate in voting aye for a Conference Committee Report when in my estimation the Conference Committee was illegally constituted. And for that reason I vote present."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...yes, take the record. On this question there are 102 ayes; 37 nos; 20 voting present. And the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report



on Senate Bill 1621. On the Order of Amendatory Vetoes Fourth Supplemental Calendar there...for what purpose does the Gentleman from Fayette, Mr. Brummet, arise?"

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce Representative Keller's mother and his wife, they're in the balcony back of the Speaker's stand."

Speaker Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Brummet."

Brummet: "And his daughter."

Speaker Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, arise?"

Giorgi: "The distinguished Minority Leader is in the left balcony, Gerald Bradley."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, on Senate Bill 1795."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with the Senate's ratification of the Governor's specific changes in the Senate Bill 1795 by Amendatory Veto. What the Governor did was to amend the Bill, this was the Bill to fund the judiciary system they amended the Bill by requiring a 25% of the money for funding judiciary system come from the Road Fund. For several years in the past we have introduced an amendment on the Judiciary Bill which would require the 25% of the payment come from the Road Fund. And the Governor said that without this Amendment it would require \$11,000,000 in unbudgeted General Revenue Fund spending in fiscal '77. So I move that we concur with the Senate's ratification of the Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Shea: "The question is on the Calendar under Amendatory Vetoes appears a motion to concur with the Senate in accepting the Governor's specific recommendation for change, with respect to Senate Bill 1795 by the adoption of the attached Amendment which is on the desk. On the motion of the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, he moves for the adoption. Is there debate? The question is, shall the House concur with the Senate in acceptance



317.

of the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1795 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kempiners is aye. Take the record. The motion prevails and the House does concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 1795; the yeas being 131; the nays being 8; 4 Members voting present. On Supplemental Calendar #6, the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, do you care to make the motion with regard to Rules, Sir?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Sir. I would move that the appropriate rule be suspended to permit action on the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, moves for the suspension of Rule 68B so that the House may hear Conference Committee Reports. Does he have leave? Is there objection? Hearing no objection the Gentleman's motion carries...there's objection, Mr. Schuneman, so we'll just go to another order of business. There's been objection. You object, Mr. Gaines, we'll go to another part of the calendar. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House pursuant to the recommendation of the Governor, the Senate has adopted amendatory provisions to a Bill of the following title and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, Senate Bill 1795. Action taken by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment 3 to a Bill of the following title, House Bill 3411. I am further directed to inform the House that the Senate requested a First Conference Committee consisting of ten Members. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of an amendment



to House Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 1739.

Action taken by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has acceded in the request of the House for a First Conference Committee to consider the difference between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1804.

Action taken by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 2007.

Concurred in by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, Senate Bill

2008. Concurred in by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, Senate

Bill 2015. Concurred in by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1997. Adopted

by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted the following Second Conference Committee Report in regard to Senate Bill 1625. Adopted by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth

Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted the following First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3377. Adopted by the Senate June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed

to inform the House the Senate has adopted the following Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3417. Action taken by the Senate June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3318. Adopted



June 30th. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted a Second Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1956. Adopted by the Senate, June 30th 1976. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted the following Second Conference Committee, Senate Bill 1524. Adopted by the Senate, June 30th. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted the following First Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1950. Adopted by the Senate, June 30th. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted the following First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2736. Adopted by the Senate, June 30th 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Speaker Shea: "House will be at ease for a few minutes. Mr. Stubblefield are you ready.... Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to tell this Chamber that I just spent a hour-and-a-half in a Conference Committee on Children and Family Services only to learn that the message from this Chamber had not been received in the Senate and consequently they hadn't even named their conferees. Now, I don't know what the game is here but somebody ought to get this mess straightened out. The real Speaker ought to be out here. He's been very conspicuous by his absence tonight, all day as a matter of fact. He was elected to be Speaker of this Chamber and he ought to be in it and he ought to be out here taking care of the business of the House. I can't imagine anything that's more important than what's going on here tonight. And if we can't get a message from here across that Chamber in less than an hour-and-a-half there sure is something wrong, Mr. Speaker, and if I were in your spot I'd look into it."

Speaker Shea: "It's been done, thank you. Would Mr. Jaffe, if he's within...thank you, Sir, you've found him. Mr. Barnes has a comment with regards to your last statement, Mr. Ryan. Turn on Mr. Barnes at Mr. Schneider's desk."



Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while there was a bit of a delay the message had reached the Senate; the Senate has appointed another Committee and I think that the matter the Gentleman was speaking about has been taken care of with dispatch."

Speaker Shea: "With dispatch. That means the prescription has been filled, Mr. Ryan. On the order of consideration postponed appears Senate Bill 1523 and on that the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill passed out of the Senate after having been created a Senate Revenue Committee by a vote 10 - nothing. Passed the Senate by a 52 to nothing. And there, in that Chamber, seemed to be noncontroversial. We ran into some trouble in this floor with a couple of the Representatives questioning whether we were going in the right direction to extend the freeze of the 1974 equalized assessed valuation through 1977. In checking with Mr. Beaupre who had been the Democratic spokesman on the Revenue Committee when 990 was passed, and he in turn checked with Representative Skinner, I think in debate some figures were given erroneously, not by myself but by other speakers. In this Bill you will only affect six counties, only six counties are affected. It allows them to extend the freeze for one additional year. In doing that they will raise additional revenue from their own tax base being held steady. And in doing that they will forfeit, to some extent, state aid dollars that otherwise would be coming to them but it will be a net-plus for them. That net-plus will only affect other counties positively meaning that there will be more money in the Distributive Formula for you. Now we, in Winnebago County and these other five counties, cannot under the formula reach the 33-1/3 assessed value without a loss of tax base and actual tax dollars. You very graciously passed out a Bill this afternoon that would provide a grant of state aid dollars to our school districts. Now let us match those



funds out of our pockets back home and let us also provide some relief for park districts, for our township government and for our county government and other taxing bodies who sorely need this relief, particularly in our county. I think it is noncontroversial and I would urge an aye vote."

Speaker Shea: "Is there an opponent to the Bill that wishes to speak on it? Mr. LaFleur, do you wish to speak against the legislation?"

LaFleur: "I would on the basis, Mr. Speaker, that this is probably the lesser of many evils but again it is a package of Bills that is getting to cause an eruption on the surface of 990; 990 was a Bill that got to the root of the problem on assessments. At the time we passed 990 we knew the conditions of Winnebago; Winnebago knew the conditions and the Bill passed overwhelmingly. Now, by passing with this formula and the basis for assessment at 33-1/3%, they've come back and they wish to take this problem and make a special issue out of it for Winnebago. We have already faced them with a grant to them; we have come back and they had a special Bill for a working cash fund. It seems like everything revolves around Winnebago. At one time Winnebago revolved around the RTA. Now the RTA is out of the window and I am sure that the Hickey Bills that are over here for schools is part of this package that everybody is going to jump on and going to support. But I can see no reason for this; there is no need for this; there would be nothing gained by it whatsoever on a hardship cause and I would urge everybody to vote no."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Stubblefield to close. It was my understanding that on...when we took Bills from Consideration Postponed that there would be one person speaking as an opponent; one person as a proponent; and the person...the Sponsor to close. Proceed, Mr. Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that recalling the debate on the other Bill, you realize that in the compromise that was necessary in order to pass the Bill, that the money that was originally in that Bill is reduced from 2.8 million dollars to



1.7 for our county. Now out of relief that we will receive two years from now when our tax base is going to jump from a 40% freeze down to 33-1/3, we would have...out of this raise about a million-and-a-half dollars that is going to be sorely needed. We have cut back in our school program to the point that we will not have a athletic program this next year. They tell me that there's two and eight-tenths million dollar deficit. We're at our borrowing level, we cannot borrow additional money. This is a needed piece of legislation that won't cost the state anything. In 990 that was passed there was an inequity that those counties which were above 33-1/3 were given only two years to get down where the ones below were given three years to get up to that level. I think it creates...corrects an inequity. Really, we need it and it does not cost the state any money, it's a self-help situation. The people back home support this legislation and I'd urge an aye vote."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1523 pass? All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. ...It was my understanding, Ladies and Gentlemen, that when we took Bills off consideration postponed I didn't know if people could explain their votes or not. What purpose does Mr. Beaupre arise? Mr. Beaupre, it's my understanding that when we called Bills on consideration postponed that we suspended that portion of the rule with regards to explanation of votes. Am I in error?"

Beaupre: "Well you may not be in error but I was trying to save the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, rather than take it. I opposed this Bill when I was up before and since then I... all right."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield, asks to poll the absentees. Poll the absentees. Geo-Karis, aye. Barnes, aye. We'll do this in an orderly fashion, the Clerk is going to call the absentees and if you wish to be recorded when your name is called



sing out."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell, Gene Barnes, Jane..."

Speaker Shea: "Eugene Barnes, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Gene Barnes, aye. Bluthardt, Boyle, Jerry Bradley,  
Caldwell, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi,..."

Speaker Shea: "Caldwell, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Caldwell, aye."

Speaker Shea: "Gerry Bradley, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Bradley, aye. Choate, Craig, Daniels, Darrow,..."

Speaker Shea: "Darrow, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Davis,..."

Speaker Shea: "Davis, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Downs, Duff,..."

Speaker Shea: "Duff, or Downs, aye."

Clerk Selcke: "Duff, Ralph Dunn,..."

Speaker Shea: "Deuster, aye. Perhaps it would help if we took a new Roll Call. Perhaps it would help the Clerk. All right, I'm going to dump this Roll Call. All those in favor vote aye; those opposed vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Porter, for which purpose do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Porter: "I'd like to make an inquiry of the Chair. Are there any other Bills that are on postponed consideration besides this one?"

Speaker Shea: "Not to my knowledge, Sir."

Porter: "I think it's a very bad practice not to have an opportunity to explain your vote because I doubt very much whether very many of the people in the House knew what they were voting on in this Bill."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 114 ayes; 31 nays; 4 Members voting present. And Senate Bill 1523 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On Calendar Supplemental: #4 appears Senate Bill 1625. And on that the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is



the result of the Second Conference Committee Report on Corrections. This is the same issue of collective bargaining; 2.3 million dollars were involved in that negotiation... Mr. Speaker, may I have some order? You did not accept the first corrections report from the Committee and you sent me back to the bargaining table for a Second Conference. In both instances I voted to replace the money for the collective bargaining in Committee. In both instances I lost on exactly the same vote, 6 to 4. Having primary concern with Mr. Sangmeister who raised an objection at that time for public safety, I then bartered with the help of the Senate and the House Members for restoration of 100 guards deleted originally by the Senate. In that negotiation I did get \$1,165,020 in an additional Amendment to replace 100 guards. I grabbed it and ran. At least to insure public safety. This doesn't solve the problem of the debt but does in part solve the problem of guards. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, that is our report, I move to concur. The General Assembly has the decision whether to concur and move this budget for immediate use or tube it. I respectfully inasmuch as we went through a lot of rhetoric with Mental Health that we don't repeat all of this. Vote it up or vote it down."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, moves that the House do adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1625. And on that is there debate? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Keller: "In this is there anything about the Road Fund money in this one, now, is that the one we had the other day?"

Kosinski: "Nothing about the Road Fund, that was another..."

Keller: "Okay. I thought this might be the Bill and I..."

Kosinski: "No, Sir, that was in the Department of..."

Keller: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a signer of Conference Committee Report #2, I point out to the General Assembly that the fiscal year '77 request was a \$102,717,000. After the action of the Second Conference Committee the bottom line figure is \$99,837,300. That's a reduction of 2.8 million from the request but it's also an increase of 8.8 million over the fiscal year '76 expenditure. I would recommend that we not go any further with this and that we adopt Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further debate? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, having spoken on the Department of Mental Health budget earlier, explaining the position of labor on that issue, I'd like to reiterate a few points. One is that if you vote favorably on the Second Conference Committee Report and the Department of Corrections, you are in effect, negating a freely entered into collective bargaining agreement that the statutes under the Department of Personnel of the State of Illinois statute book call for. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the issue isn't whether or not we want to tube the Department of Corrections budget. We didn't tube, necessarily, by some affirmative votes or negative votes the Middle Fork yet; we sent that back even though it was the Second Conference; so we don't have to get too nervous about not giving the necessary votes at this time on this Conference Committee Report. I'd like to point out that in the prison where the guards are already underpaid and they have entered into negotiations some of which feel and deserve, truly deserve more money than even the contracts call for, that if we don't restore the money that was entered into by negotiation you may as well give a lot of tennis shoes to those guards and a lot of tennis shoes to those prisoners because the gates may open up and who's to blame? Not the people that really are at fault, not those who don't believe in collective bargaining, but those who were elected saying they're



friends of labor. Those who were elected campaigning up and down their districts saying that they stand by the side of working men and working women in their cause of social justice. Now some people say, 'well, Hanahan, what are you doing, you're supporting AFSCME'. Well, let me tell you something. This is not an AFSCME issue. Three weeks ago we had an issue for the Teamsters and overwhelmingly this House allowed by registration a \$3,000,000 deficiency to the Department of Transportation to allow that money to be paid based on a collective bargaining agreement between the Teamsters and the Department of Transportation. Now I wonder how many people voted for that so far today haven't come to their senses about the same issue when it comes to the Department of Corrections or Mental Health or Children and Family Services? I'd just like to point out, I don't believe that the candidate for the Democratic nomination for Governor of this state could sit by and allow this to happen when just a few days ago he said that he supports the concept of collective bargaining. Now I don't know who's leading the Democratic Party in this state but the issue is..."

Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Hanahan: "I thought I had ten minutes, Sir. I looked...my watch only says three, unless you want to put the timer on. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we should have some direction and the direction should come from those who are responsible to lead and so far we haven't witnessed that. I wish somebody would get on the phone with Mike Howlett and find out where he stands on this issue. Lots of county chairmen around this state would like to know also and as President of the Democratic County Chairman, I'd like to know where he stands on the issue before Democrats are asked to negate a collective bargaining agreement. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, to do away in a civilized society the rights of contract, to negate it through this system is not only bad but it's almost illegal. And if the prison doors open up, only those that vote aye on this measure got themselves to blame because, Mr.



Speaker, if I were a prison guard and my contract was negated through the actions of this Legislature I'd walk off the job. And I think that many other people will do the same thing. So when you vote on this issue remember this is the labor issue and the principle on this is no different than the principle on the plumbers, the electricians, the carpenters, the barber, the machinists or anyone else that works for law enforcement. If you negate the contract entered into by those prison guards you may as well negate the contract that the building trades have entered into with the prevailing rate position of this state. I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this would be a bad day for labor if this Conference Committee is adopted. I ask for a negative vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, will the Sponsor yield? Representative Kosinski, since the First Conference Committee Report until the one you worked I know so diligently and hard on, this additional money is strictly for new guards, is that correct?"

Kosinski: "Yes, Sir. Approximately 100 new guards will be provided to give the security that you request, and I requested, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Well, I certainly don't want to put down your effort and you should be complimented because I'm sure we could all use new guards but my next question is, and it is also true that these funds cannot be used to supplement the pay for the existing guards, is that right? Or the collective bargaining that we've been arguing about."

Kosinski: "This is nontangible money, it is not put in for the collective bargaining issue. This is put in specifically for new guards."

Sangmeister: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Sangmeister: "I'm not going to stand here and make all the arguments that we made the first time the report came up. I, again, do



want to compliment Roman for trying to put this thing together but those of us who have penal institutions in our districts are still concerned that what the result of this may be. I hope that Representative Hanahan is 100% wrong. I would hope that those people would be more responsible than to go on some kind of strike or walk off their jobs if this commitment is not upheld to. But God forbid that that should happen anywhere in this state. On that basis I would ask you to vote against the adoption of Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for one question?"

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Ewing: "When we were discussing this issue before was there comments that there were funds that could be used to pay for the collective bargaining for the first six months of this coming year?"

Kosinski: "None that I was aware of."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, here we go again.

We did this same thing a little while ago. Excuse me. We're not going to rescind the action we took a while ago. The Sponsor of this piece of legislation, Roman Kosinski, has told us very frankly that he's not in favor of this Conference Report. He's bringing it back to us because the other Members signed it. Well, if the guy has done a good job for this House of Representatives in this Conference Committee, I think we ought to stand up for him. We ought to stand up for those state employees who negotiated with the State of Illinois in good faith, who want to protect the citizens from the criminals in the penitentiaries who I am sure will not walk off the job if we don't give them what they negotiated for in good faith. If there is an argument, the argument ought to have been made about the Executive Order not the conditions that followed. Now the State of Illinois negotiated with the labor union that



is recognized as the bargaining agent for state employees. And we ought to recognize that and we ought to send this back with everyone of those red lights up there to show the Senate what we've been talking about. We did it before and we better do it again, live up to the faith of state employees and give them what we negotiated. Put on those red lights."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington. Harold, I saw you."

Washington: "You finally made up, Jerry, I appreciate it. Now hear this, Jerry. Mr. Hanahan, I think, came up with a capital suggestion. He suggested to we Democrats that we contact our fine candidate for governor, and he is fine, and he will be governor and ask him clearly, oh yes, and ask clearly where he stands on this collective bargaining issue. But, Tom, I don't think we have to go that far. Our leaders are right here on this floor, they haven't been listening to you and Fred Schraeder and to me. I suggest we walk over to our leaders and ask them why they're not following Mr. Howlett's suggestion and if that doesn't do it maybe we ought to caucus and have it out in a family affair. But I am ashamed, ashamed, abominably ashamed that my Democratic leaders don't see fit to give this money to labor after that's been negotiated through the legal process. As Schraeder says 'it's too late to fight the results if you didn't like the Executive Order you should have fought that'. I challenge the Leadership on my side of the aisle to get off your haunches, stop playing political games, and get down to taking care of the people's business. Mr. Leinenweber, Mr. Sangmeister have made it very clear to you what the problem is. These guards are not going to strike but do you want disgruntled guards? do you want prisons undermanned? Do you want prisons unmanned? I say anybody who does insist on an absolute top dollar amount is being irresponsible. I could expect it from this side. I can't tolerate it from this side."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for my



own part I don't believe that we should lay back and succumb to a collective bargaining agreement. On the hand, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is nothing in this Bill as I understand it from the Conference Committee Report which provides for any kind of pay raise at all for the prison guards. Do you know that we pay the prison guards in this state when they take their job less than \$11,000 a year? Slightly more than \$10,000. Now, I would suggest to you that if you want to get high quality people and you want people to go through the training programs that we need in our correctional institutions that you have got to be able to give men and women, at that wage, at least some kind of cost of living increase. I would further suggest to you and I think,...

Mr. Speaker, could I get a little attention, please? Mr. Speaker. That was a good try, Mr. Speaker, want to try one more time?"

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this summer when Joliet and Pontiac and Menard are hot and sweaty and overcrowded, as you all know, since we no longer can have the optimum prison population per foot, per cell, I would suggest to you that when all hell breaks loose in our prisons and our prison guards go on strike it's gonna cost this Assembly and this state a whole lot more money to bring the national guard in than it is to give a minimal cost of living increase to these people who deserve it. If any of you have ever visited the hellholes we call prisons and you talk to the kinds of people that we hire you would not hesitate for one moment to give those men and women a pay raise."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. This debate has gone on long enough."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say aye; those opposed nay. In the opinion of the Chair the ayes have it. You want a Roll Call



JUN 30 1976

330.

on it? All right, all those in favor of closing debate will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 105 ayes; 23 nays and the Gentleman's motion carries. Bradley aye on that last motion. Back to Mr. Kosinski to close."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I told you what I did. I grabbed a million one thirty-six; got a hundred extra prison guards; I've done my job. You know the issue. You vote this up or down."

Speaker Shea: "The question is, shall the Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1625 pass? All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay."



Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Hanahan said that we should contact Members not in this General Assembly... Representative Washington, indicated... we ought to ask our Leadership. Well, I would suggest to that Gentlemen, that we're too late... we're too late to protect the interest of labor because those interests... those four flags, that birthright of the labor promise was sold out at that sorry day in the Bismarck Hotel, when labor turned their back on the best labor Governor they had... the current Governor, has supported, as Stanley Johnson, has pointed out... the programs of labor, he has endorsed those programs and they were sold out... and why were they sold out... they were sold out for a vacuous political promise. Representative from McHenry, it was a sad day for labor... when they sold out what was good. What had been done, what was done on the merits of the case for labor legislation, everyone knows..."

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

Laurino: "The Gentleman from Cook, is our of order, I wish he would confine his remarks to the Bill at hand."

Speaker Shea: "Keep your remarks to the Bill, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this motion... not to concur, because I think public employees ought not to be treated as second class citizens and I would suggest that some of the people who would consider themselves as advocates of labor to examine and look at the record. Where have we come in the last four years and what did we abandon and what do we have to look forward to."



Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, to explain his vote."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on an earlier issue I stood on the side of the employees of the state..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Lauer, excuse me for a minute. Will the Members please be in their seats? Will the Members please be in their seats? Mr. Houlihan. Will the Members please be in their seats? All right, Mr. Lauer, proceed. Turn Mr. Lauer on, please?"

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I'm already turned on. All I need is a microphone. Mr. Speaker, in an earlier issue that was before this House, I have stood with state employees through, I think six or seven, Roll Call votes. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that at this point I will say this to those who advocate a position that requires that this House must do a certain thing that may or may not be according to the conscience of the Members of this House. I have stood with these people but I will tell you this threaten me not one more time because you have lost me at this point. And to those who are sitting in the galleries and who are attempting to apply pressure, believe me gentlemen, you cannot apply pressure to me. Do not make threats. Do not makes threats because if you make threats all then I say is I accept your challenge and you go right ahead and do your damn work. And I will see you in hell before I'll vote with you if you threaten me."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Riccolo to explain his vote."

Riccolo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my no vote on this issue. In my district I have six correctional centers which is the largest number of any district in the state and I've visited each one of those institutions. And every one that I've been in the same complaint is raised, 'we don't have enough employees, we don't have enough correctional staff'. Now the state employees that staff those institutions entered into negotiations in good



faith and to quote that great Gentleman from Lawrence, 'we would be less than magnanimous if we deprive them of that right'. I urge a no vote. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Gaines to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to, once again, admonish the Members of this House that they're having a double standard when they say that it's all right to have a prevailing wage for the members of the craft unions but yet when you have the unions representing other state employees you say no. That is why I'm being consistent. I feel that every worker, regardless of his trade, is equal to every other worker. And if it is perfectly all right for a carpenter and it's perfectly all right for a truck driver, then it also ought to be perfectly all right for a social worker, a corrections guard or a typist. It is all right or all wrong. If the state has the authority to enter into a contract with the Teamsters..."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Gaines: "...Social workers or the jail guards. On that basis I want everyone to know that we have some Republican friends in labor over here and I'm one of them."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. But, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, looking up at that board I know that an explanation of votes is not going to change anything here. But I think some amount of sanity should come to what we are doing here tonight. I want to commend Representative Kosinski for the hard work he did on two Conference Committees, I know because I sat in on both. But let me say this about this budget that we're discussing now. One thing that we're doing here with this Conference Committee Report is increasing this budget by 9.63%. Last year this department expended \$91,069,600 and with this Conference Committee Report that will increase to \$99,837,300.



I have stayed with labor on each one of these votes but in this case I think it's time for some fiscal sanity to..."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, I will close, Mr. Speaker. I think in this case it's time for some fiscal sanity to come to this House. We're talking about a net change in this Conference Committee Report itself of 2.879 million dollars and if any department that has within its coffers 98 million dollars cannot operate in operations we simply should not fund that agency. I think that this agency can, it has about a half a million dollars that's simply within that budget that we did not strike out in the Appropriations Committee. This will give them more than \$3,000,000 to adequately fund any raises that they would have to encumber in the next six months. I rise to vote aye on this motion."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco, to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my red vote but before I do so if you will indulge with me, I'd like to pass on what I think is a constructive criticism. As one of the three Members of the Conference Committee who dissented from the majority vote, I find myself a little bit embarrassed when I pick up the sheet and I find that seven people signed it; three of us of course did not sign it. I was not asked whether I wanted to sign it or not and I'm not blaming the Chairman, I think he assumed I would not sign it. I'd like to suggest that somewhere in the form, or on the form next year, there should be something saying 'the vote of this Conference Committee was seven to three, these three were dissenting'. I think somewhere we ought to be able to sign our name and show that we dissented with the final decision. According to this, I may not even have been in attendance at that Conference. My name does not appear on here and some of my friends will say 'you were on the Conference and you weren't even there'..."



Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Lucco: "...Think we got enough out of the Conference."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there are 68 ayes and 88 nos and the Gentleman's...Mr. Griesheimer, did I miss your... And the Gentleman's motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #2 fails.

Mr. Griesheimer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I might have your attention for just a moment, a very important and solemn event has taken place this day in Chicago which I think this House should know about. As you know, the fiscal new year is at hand and there is reason for truly great joy in the hearts of all suburban Legislators. You will be pleased to know that in one hour and one minute the RTA will be out of business."

Speaker Shea: "Go ahead, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Before suburban members of the RTA Board refused to approve the budget for the RTA, and it will be out of business as of midnight for lack of funds. May I suggest a few moments of silence for Mr. Pikarsky?"

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, just so the Gentleman that spoke last doesn't confuse us too much, I feel very confident even though I'm in opposition to RTA that someone will call on Mr. Blair and he will get it moving again."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "On this I was going to rise, too, and tell my colleague from Waukegan that before he and the rest of us start dancing in the aisles, bet it'll all be revived like a few other things around here are going to be revived shortly."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I have a request to make of the Chair. This is, at least supposed to be, the last night of the General Assembly Session. It becomes very difficult and we're approaching a late hour and I'm wondering if we might be relieved of the



photographer's lights for the rest of this Session."

Speaker Shea: "Well, let's turn them off for a while."

Tipsword: "Let's leave it off."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to get back to the last matter that we discussed in the defeat of the report. I'd like to go on record in saying that I hope that this is submitted to a Third Conference Report without having discussed it so it's on the record."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, I'd just like to congratulate Representative Hill, it's taken him several years to realize what a leader Mr. Blair is and tonight he's admitted it. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, Gene."

Hoffman: "Mr. Who?"

Speaker Shea: "Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Who in terms of who Mr. Ryan and Mr. Hill were referring to."

Speaker Shea: "Well, we'll stand at ease until about 11:15 for messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following title, to-wit: House Bill 3656 together with three amendments. Passed by the Senate, as amended, June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request to the House for a Second Conference Committee on House Bill 3377. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1976. Kenneth..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Clerk, might I remind the photographers that the light to take pictures is off and there will be no pictures taken in the Chambers when that light is off. Proceed, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives



the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Second Conference Committee on House Bill 3392. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a First Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1739. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment 2 to a Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 1749. Concurred in by the Senate June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1603. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1650. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1804. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Speaker Shea: "We'll stand at ease until the hour of 11:15 when we can call Mr. Schuneman's Bill. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 973, Jane Barnes. 974, Simms. 975, Farley. 977, Kornowicz. 978, Jim Houlihan."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, the Assistant Majority Leader, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 973 by Jane Barnes, honors



JUN 30 1976

338.

the remarkable work done by the Republican pages. House Resolution 974 by Simms, asks the Department of Public Aid to investigate the Day Care money for Adults. House Resolution 975 by Farley, congratulates the work of the Democratic pages in the House. House Resolution 977 by Kornowicz, honors Theodore Swinarski for 50 years of dedicated work. And House Resolution 978 by James Houlihan, honors Eve and Steven Schwab on the birth of their child. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor will say aye; those opposed nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 976..."

Speaker Shea: "Speaker's table. On the order of Supplemental Calendar #7...on Supplemental Calendar #7, I understand the Amendments are not on the desks yet, they're being printed. They'll be out in a little bit. On Supplemental Calendar #6 appears Senate Bill 1804. And on that, the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1804 is a Bill that affects the State Employee's Group Insurance Program and there were some minor technical differences between the Senate and the House. The Conference Committee has been adopted, Conference Committee has met and agreed. And I would move the House do adopt the Report of the First Conference Committee."

Speaker Shea: "Did you explain what the Conference Committee did, Sir, I didn't hear you."

Schuneman: "No, Sir, I did not explain in detail. It changes the... For example, it changes the word 'parent' and indicates that male employees or female employees can add their dependent children to the group insurance contract. Very minor change. Move the House do adopt this report."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, moves



that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report 1804.

And on the question is there any debate? Is there any debate? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Shea: "I don't think anybody seriously cares what we do with our insurance if I understand the... Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "I'm just trying to help out a very good piece of legislation. I think we should adopt it and move the previous question."

Speaker Shea: "You want to go through it one more time, Mr. Schuneman?"

Schuneman: "Well, not really, Mr. Speaker, but if you want me to, I will. The change doesn't amount to anything. Is there any questions? I'll be happy to respond to questions otherwise I move the adoption of the report."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, we're in good hands with Mr. Schuneman, so we'll go ahead."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1804. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 131 ayes; no nays; no Members voting present. And the House does concur in Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1804. The House will stand at ease for a few minutes while we wait for some Amendment to be brought up. Mr. Richmond, for what purpose do you arise?"

Richmond: "Point of personal privilege, if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Richmond: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you might recall this morning Representative DiPrima extended an invitation to you, to all of us, concerning the convention in Chicago. I would like to extend the same type of invitation concerning another organization. As past State President of the Illinois Elks Association and present Grand Lodge Officer, I would like to welcome all of you to the Grand Lodge Convention of the



JUN 30 1976

340.

Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks which is being held this coming week at the Conrad Hilton in Chicago. I'm not sure whether Representative DiPrima's bill will extend to the Elks as far as transportation for official visitors; possibly it will, if not I imagine it can be arranged. I hope we're finished in time so I can attend. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from... The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader Mr. Davis, for the purpose of an introduction."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have two very distinguished ladies in the Speaker's gallery here to present to you. One is the wife of my Senator, Senator Fred J. Smith, from the 22nd District. I'd like to present to you, Mrs. Fred J. Smith, wife of Senator Smith of the 22nd District. And with her is the secretary to Senator Dougherty, Mrs. Bob Easley. Will you please stand so they can see these beautiful ladies here in the House?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The House will be in order. On Supplemental Calendar #7 appears Conference Committee Reports on House Bill 3411. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at this time I'd like to accept and move to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on 3411. This has to do with..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Van Duyne..."

Van Duyne: "...Amendment #3."

Speaker Giorgi: "...Just a moment. Mr. Skinner, for what reason do you arise?"

Skinner: "I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "State your point."

Skinner: "The calendar was distributed at 11:10 and the Conference Committee Report was distributed at 11:20 and I can't possibly think three hours have elapsed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Van Duyne, would you move that the necessary rule be suspended to do away with that rule in the rules?"

Van Duyne: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move to suspend the necessary



rules in order to make this report at this time."

Speaker Giorgi: "You heard the motion...Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, in order to save some time, why wouldn't the Sponsor come over and discuss this with the Minority Leader?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, we'll take a few moments for that. Representative Matijevich, for what reason do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I was just talking to Representative Hill and he tells me that House Bill, or Senate Bill 1932 is so heavy now that they can't even carry it from the Senate back over here. Is that true?"



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

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by which Conference Committee #2... on Senate Bill 1650, failed, I now move that the vote be reconsidered."

Speaker Giorgi: "Do we have the Roll Call... did you vote on the prevailing side, Mr. Anderson? How did you vote, Mr. Anderson?"

Anderson: "No."

Speaker Giorgi: "He voted 'no'. Representative Madison, for what reason do you arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I move that that motion lie on the Table."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson, has moved to reconsider the question, Representative Madison, has moved to lay that motion on the Table... Representative Ryan, for what reason do you arise?"

Ryan: "For a Parliamentary inquiry, can you tell me what the Bill is? What is the Bill number... 34..."

Speaker Giorgi: "1650... Senate Bill 1650."

Ryan: "And, that's the Community College Bill?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I think that it is."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ron Hoffman, for what reason do you rise?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask a Roll Call vote on that."

Speaker Giorgi: "We'll have a Roll Call on Anderson's motion to reconsider the vote by which 1650, was defeated and then Madison's motion to lie it on the Table. The vote is on the motion by Representative Anderson's vote... motion to Table... All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. This is a motion to Table. Representative Daniels."



Daniels: "Just a point of Parliamentary Inquiry. And, clarification in this late hour, if we support Representative Anderson, motion then we would vote red, is that correct?"

Speaker Giorgi: "That's right."

Daniels: "And, if we want this Bill reconsidered... then we would vote red."

Speaker Giorgi: "That's correct."

Daniels: "So, I want to vote red."

Speaker Giorgi: "That's right, you know the majority red votes.... repeat the motion to Table. Has everyone voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this vote there are 89 'nays'... Representative Madison, would you like to explain your vote?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious to me these people aren't here and I want a verification."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, there are 36 'ayes' and 89 'no', I would suggest that's dilatory."

Speaker Giorgi: "All right, the Chair will rule that it is."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, without impugning the ruling of the prior Speaker, a verification has been requested and it is the custom to honor that request and I would ask that you do so."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, arise?"

Anderson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is being dilatory because if you add all the people that didn't vote to the people that did vote, they still couldn't beat the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does Mr. Madison, arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not concerned about asking the



people that didn't vote to the people that did vote, I'm concerned about the people who didn't vote that did vote."

Speaker Shea: "Perhaps if we just dump the Roll Call... Mr. Tipsword, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Tipsword: "For an inquiry of the Chair. How many votes is required to either pass or defeat the motion? Just a majority of voting?"

Speaker Shea: "On a motion to Table, it is a simple majority of those voting on the question excluding those voting 'present'. All right, the posture of this Roll Call as I understand it, Mr. Anderson, made a motion to reconsider the vote by which 1650 lost. On that motion Mr. Madison made a motion to lie upon the Table and that is what the Roll Call in front of me represents, is that right, Mr. Madison?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of being dilatory I don't have...."

Speaker Shea: "I didn't ask you that, Sir. I asked you if I'm in the right posture."

Madison: "You're in the right posture."

Speaker Shea: "Verify the negative Roll Call. Mr. Madison... Turn Mr. Madison, on... yes, I did... Yes, Sir."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I was trying to indicate to you, I do not wish to be dilatory, I will except a new Roll Call but if I see people walking around voting other people's switches, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to ask for verification. If we will dump this Roll Call and try it again and I get an honest count... and I won't ask for verification... but, if I see people voting switches then I will."

Speaker Shea: "All right, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, arise?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, unless you're the Appellate Court the



Chair has ruled that the motion or the request of verification was dilatory. They do have another resort and that is, if they want to overrule the Chair. that's their option."

Speaker Shea: "Well, now I said that I was going to dump the Roll Call and take a new Roll Call and Mr. Walsh, thought that would be alright, is that right, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "I beg your pardon, I didn't hear the question. What did you say, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "I was going to dump this Roll Call and take a new Roll..."

Walsh: "It will be alright with me, if that will avoid a verification, I'm for that."

Speaker Shea: "Okay, we will dump this Roll Call and take a new Roll Call. The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, has made a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Conference Committee Report #2, on Senate Bill 1650 lost. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, moved that lay upon the Table... on Mr. Madison's vote to lay upon the Table, all those in favor will vote 'aye'... to vote with Mr. Madison and vote 'no', to vote with Mr. Anderson. Mr. Lauer, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification. I would like to point out to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, who said... Mr. Speaker, how can you make that ruling and I will have to agree that I'm in agreement to the ruling of the Chair. I would point out that when you have the gavel and 89 votes... Mr. Mann, sit down and shut up."

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

Mann: "On a point of personal privelege, Mr. Speaker. That's the old 'cheap shot' artist, you remember him... he was



the guy that said, when the Mayor was down here, that he resented the fact that the Mayor was elbowing people out of the elevator. The old 'cheap shot' artist... you're still at it old buddy."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh, arise?"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, just to suggest to Representative Lauer, that he's been 'cheap shot' back and he would be just as well to let it go at that and get on with the business."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I thought I made my point very clear and not trying to be dilatory, but you dumped the Roll Call and you asked for a new Roll Call and I specifically saw individual Members of this House pushing other persons switches and I therefore request a verification on this Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Anderson, request a poll of the absentees. Mr. Lauer, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Lauer: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. And, I would like to have some order."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Lauer: "The Gentleman has accused me of a 'cheap shot'... I would recall to the Gentleman's memory... that when I objected to an overzealous application to duty... some of the Mayor's gentlemen last Session... it was pointed out to me and I acknowledge that this was probably an overzealous application of the Mayor's men without the knowledge of the Mayor. I did not make a 'cheap shot' towards the Mayor and I'm not making a 'cheap shot' now... I would suggest to the Gentleman from Cook, that his use of the word 'cheap shot', is in itself a cheap shot' and if he has any kind of integrity, he will back it up with a great deal more than the cheap shallow



iniquity charge of 'cheap shot' because that was not done."

Speaker Shea: "Would the Members please be in their seats. Would the Members please be in their seats. Would the Members please be in their seats. Would those people not entitled to the floor of the House of Representatives please remove themselves. Would those people not entitled to the floor of the House, please remove themselves. Mr. Doorkeeper, there are people sitting in the seats of this House that are not Members, please ask them to leave. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman, arise?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think obviously at this time of night everybody's a little short on temper, but the purpose for which we are addressing this subject matter now... is going to change drastically in the next few minutes because after 12 o'clock, this particular issue is going to require 107. I suggest that the House address itself to the Bill at hand."

Speaker Shea: "You're absolutely correct, Sir. Now, Mr. Mann, do you seek recognition?"

Mann: "Yes, Sir, I do."

Speaker Shea: "Now, Mr. Mann, and I don't want to become a referee up here to either you or Mr. Lauer, or any other Member, but we could go back and forth for hours... trying to explain our votes, so I would ask the Gentleman please, in their remarks to refrain from speaking of other Members so that we may conduct the business of the House."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong this... I was just going to suggest that Mr. Lauer, felt so badly about his 'cheap shot' at the Mayor, he ought to send an apology to him, that's all."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from



Marion, Mr. Friedrich, arise?"

Friedrich: "I was just going to suggest that we cut off the feud between the two Members and get to work."

Speaker Shea: "Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, has requested a poll of the absentees... Yes, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't appreciate the fact that I've been accused of being dilatory in my tactics. Mr. Speaker, when I was sworn into this House... I was sworn in with the full knowledge that I had all the rights and would assume all the responsibility, if not all the privileges as any other Member of this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, I accept the fact that I have... I accept the fact that I have all the responsibilities if not the privileges and because I accept my responsibility, I demand my rights."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Madison, as long as I sit in this Chair, I'll protect the Minority as well as the Majority because I know how you feel... I was there last night, remember. Take the record. Proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Arnell, Beatty, Berman, Bluthardt, Brinkmeier, Campbell, Capuzi, Choate, Craig, Darrow, Deuster, Duff, John Dunn, Giglio, Giorgi, Hirschfeld, Klosak, Kornowicz, Leverenz, Lucco, Madigan, Matijevich, McPartlin, Miller, Molloy, Porter, Rayson..."

Speaker Shea: "Rayson, 'aye'. Darrow, 'no', Porter, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rose, Shea, Von Boeckman, White, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Mr. Ebbesen, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. I look at that board and there are 102 red votes as you combine 40 and 33, which we know that there are 10 or 15, of those on that blue side... even using



modern math, if this is not dilatory... I don't know what the hell is. Now, why don't you rule accordingly and get on with the business of this House."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed with the verification of the negative vote."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, J.M. Barnes, Beaupre, Birchler, Boyle..."

Speaker Shea: "Change Mr. Matijevich, to 'aye' and for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if I understand the rules of verification, it requires the Members to be in their seats and those persons that are not entitled to the floor should be removed."

Speaker Shea: "All right, would the Members please be in their seats... would the Members please be in their seats. Proceed with the verification of the negative vote. Mr. Boyle, wishes to be verified because he's at a meeting in the Speaker's office, Mr. Madison, is that agreeable with you, Sir. Mr. Madison, Mr. Boyle, wishes to be verified. Do you have any objection? Proceed with the verification of the negative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett Bradley, Gerald Bradley, Brandt, Brummet, Carroll..."

Speaker Shea: "I think some people would just like to see midnight and film a few clips. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Coffey, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, Darrow, Deavers, DiPrima, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewing, Farley, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Dan Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Jacobs, Kane, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Kozubowski, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Londrigan..."



Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Effingham, arise?"

Keller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is almost getting close to that magic hour and I think that Representative Tipword should sing Auld Lang Syne."

Clerk O'Brien: "Luft, Mahar, Maragos, Mautino, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, Meyer, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Patrick, Peters, Pierce, Polk, Pouncey, Randolph, Reed, Riccolo, Richmond, Rigney, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Schuneman, Sevcik, Simms, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Tipword, Totten, Tuerk, Van Duynes, Vitek, Waddell, Wall, Walsh, Washburn, Winchester, Wolf."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Madison, do you have any... Mr. Beatty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Beatty: "Would you record me 'no', please."

Speaker Shea: "Record Mr. Beatty, as 'no'. Mr. Ewell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, since we're about to enter that magical area of the living law with no ethics, I would like to be recorded as 'present' on this vote and all subsequent votes. Thank you."

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

Washington: "I would like the record to show that the House clock shows 12:05."

Speaker Shea: "I don't know if the House is correct or not, Sir, but..."

Washington: "I don't care whether you know it or not, I want the record to show that it shows, show."

Speaker Shea: "Well, can I tell you what the record will show, Mr. Washington?"

Washington: "I would assume it would show what I said, Mr.



Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "No, it will show what is right, Mr. Washington. Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious to me that during the call of verification that the opponents to my motion was able to rouse up the people who were voted for. So, I will cease and desist from my verification request."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Fleck, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Fleck: "Actually a point of information, Mr. Speaker and I think that all the Members will be very interested to know. Earlier we discussed the question of whether there would be a Third Conference Committee and what would happen after 12 o'clock, now obviously it's past 12 o'clock and matters of importance might need 107 votes to pass. Has the Leadership between the House and the Senate decided yet... whether there will be one, reconference Committee appointed and two, what is our posture in regard to the number of votes to pass Appropriation Bills."

Speaker Shea: "Any Bill that passes after the hour of 12 o'clock, starting on July 1, to become effective immediately... it will take 107 votes. With regard..."

Fleck: "What does the Speaker say now in regard to my first..."

Speaker Shea: "Well, can I get there Mr. Fleck? At the present time the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House are meeting in his office and as soon as I find out, I'll let you know. Mr. Tipsword, for what purpose do you arise?"

Tipsword: "For a purpose of a motion, Sir."

Speaker Shea: "Well, I think I can solve the motion for you before you put it, Sir. Gentleman you've filmed the midnight hour, we're shutting off the T.V. cameras and getting back to work. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, arise?"



Walsh: "For the purpose of informing the Speaker and the President, if they are listening, that it might be a good idea to have the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate in on their conference. If indeed they're talking about the problem that we have here."

Speaker Shea: "I'm sure that will, Sir. Mr. Madison, you have withdrawn your motion, is that correct, Sir... for verification..."

Madison: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker and I would like to the Chair's attention to rule 68, as it relates to this and all other Conference Committee Reports which specifically say, that if the reports are not called by June 30, they die and shall be Table.... shall not be revived, and that suspension of this rule can be accomplished only by a 107 votes and it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the suspension of this rule would have had to taken place prior to July 1."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook... from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, that's not really true... although I may be with you on this issue, Representative Madison. All it says, is that Conference Committee have to report by June 30, they reported... they complied with that rule and now...either it's going to have to go along with the report, though they are going to need a 107 votes now. That's the difference."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I plainly recall you saying on a number of occasions that if a Conference Committee was not... report was not adopted, then automatically that went to another Conference Committee Report. Mr. Speaker Conference Committee Report #2, on Senate Bill 1650,



was not adopted and the third Conference Committee has not reported."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, arise?"

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion pending, I wished we would go ahead with the business of the House."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman has raised a point of order... and we shall see... Mr. Minority Leader, could you come up here for a minute..... Would the House please stand at ease for a few moments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We just met with the Republican Leadership and decided that the best thing to do... would be to move to adjourn until 11 o'clock in the morning and there will be a meeting of the Republican and Democratic Leadership at 10, and probably immediately after we come in at 11, tomorrow morning, there will be conferences of the respective parties. So, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Recess."

Shea: "I would move that we now recess until the hour of 11 o'clock A.M., today."

Speaker Redmond: "You have heard the Gentleman's motion, all in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion is carried."

Speaker Redmond: "The House is in recess until 11 A.M."

