

1.

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

Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Alan Barth said; Public service has always offered and will continue to offer, the greatest challenge to those who can bring to it a sense of honor and dedication. Let us pray. Almighty God, we come to Thee this day as we endeavor to complete the duties before us as Members of this Illinois House of Representatives. We are grateful, O, Lord, for the challenges and opportunities that have been ours to consider. We pray to Thee, O Father, that that which we have done may be acceptable in Thy sight. For that which we have not done, or for that which has been in error, do Thou, O Lord, guide our hearts and minds that we may provide suitable amendment when we are afforded the opportunity. Accept our labors and give to us Thy blessings that we may continue our daily course of life in peace and safety and return to our duties to serve the people of Illinois refreshed in body, mind and spirit; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, pledge of allegiance."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I just wanted to report I'm sorry I missed the war bulletins yesterday. I have a problem down in Louisiana that I have to solve in which I have finished solving. Now that part is none of your business. However, being experienced in certain underground movements etc.,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6-30-79

etc., I have discovered yesterday and today that we have a force as of yesterday. Particularly I discovered we had a force that are called, 'The Knights of the Golden Circle.' They are descendants of the Civil War people that favored the South and they lived in Illinois, mostly in .. they were mostly Democrat. Well, I believe they have resurrected themselves against the best economic interests of the State of Illinois and aligned themselves with the states of Wisconsin, Indiana and Louisiana. I think we should beware and I hope our Major-General, Griesheimer, who I see is missing- I hope doing his duty- will watch them very, very closely because we have this internal group that may be against our best interests. And I hate to mention it, Mr. Speaker, but I'm watching you very closely, the Leader of that group. So be careful."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, judging from the sign that we saw on your desk the other day, we're really not planning on your services. Rep.."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I admit that the sign was there and I do not claim that sign. Now, it is better to make love than war. That's true. And I can understand that. But since I belong to an older generation, I believe defense to your country is more important than making love. But some of these younger fellows haven't learned that... learned that's the maximum as yet. So I realize that they're more impaled for love than for war, but we older fellows, I think we like war better than love."

Speaker Redmond: "It was the other side of the sign that I referred to."

Borchers: "Oh, well. That's another matter entirely. Did you comment..... you all on the other side of the sign."

Speaker Redmond: "I was really... I was really surprised at you. One more comment."



Borchers: "One more comment. I.. My spies of the underground have informed me that none other than yourself was one of the principal Sponsors of that sign on my desk and I think... Well, I don't know what to think about it. But I'm told that you are one of the principal Sponsors of that sign and I.. well, as my Leader, I think you'd better resign. For the moment anyway."

Speaker Redmond: "Constitutional Amendment. Second Reading. House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment 13. Moved to Third Reading. Read it the Third time as amended. First,... First time on Third Reading as amended. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13; Resolved the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein; that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 11 to Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows; Article IX Section 11; Limitations of total of State taxes, on the share committed to local governments and on ad valorem property taxes- prohibition of mandate of local programs without state funding- provisions for the transfer of programs. (a); There is hereby established a limit on the taxes imposed by the General Assembly for any fiscal year. The State shall not impose taxes of any kind, which, together with all other revenues of the State, except revenues received from the Federal Government, revenues received by the State revolving funds, receipts from the sale of general obligation bonds, and contributions to the earnings of trust funds in the custody of the State Treasurer, shall exceed 8% of the average annual personal income of 11-



4.

Illinois of the next to last full calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins and the prior two calendar years. "Personal income of Illinois" is the total income received by persons in Illinois from all sources, including transfer payments, as defined and officially reported by the United States Department of Commerce or its successor agency. No expenses of State Government shall be incurred for any fiscal year which exceed in amount the revenue limit established by this Section. (b) For any fiscal year in the event that total revenues of the State exceed the revenue limit established in subsection (a) of this Section, this excess shall be transferred to the Budget Stabilization Fund in the State Treasury. Emergency expenditures from the Budget Stabilization Fund may be made only if all the following conditions are met; 1. The Governor requests the General Assembly to declare an emergency; 2. The request is specific as to the nature of the emergency and the dollar amount of the emergency; and 3. The General Assembly thereafter declares an emergency in accordance with the Governor's request by a Joint Resolution adopted by a three-fifths vote of the Members elected to each house. The Bills providing for the appropriation of funds for the emergency must be passed by a three-fifths vote of the Members elected to each house. "Total revenues of the State" means all public funds received by the State but does not include revenues received from Federal Government, revenues received by the State's revolving funds, receipts from the sale of general obligation bonds, nor the contributions to and earnings of trust funds in the custody of the State Treasurer. If it is determined that the amount in the Budget Stabilization Fund is less than the amount needed to meet an emergency situation, taxes in excess of the limit established in subsection



5.

(a) of this Section may be imposed and collected only if all of the following conditions are met; 1. The Governor requests the General Assembly to declare an emergency; 2. The request is specific as to the nature of the emergency, the dollar amount of the emergency and the method by which the emergency will be funded; and 3. Upon receiving the request the General Assembly declares an emergency in accordance with the specifications of the Governor's request by a Joint Resolution adopted by a two-thirds vote of the Members elected to each house. The Bills providing for the appropriation of funds for the emergency must be passed by a two-thirds vote of the Members elected to each house. The emergency must be declared in accordance with these procedures prior to the incurring of any of the expense which constitutes the specific emergency request. The revenue limitation may be exceeded only for the fiscal year in which the emergency is declared; in subsequent fiscal years the revenue limit of subsection (a) of this Section shall again take effect. An emergency shall not be declared in two successive fiscal years without the approval of a majority of the qualified electors of the state voting thereon. Income earned from the funds maintained in the Budget Stabilization Fund shall occur (sic) (accrue) to the fund. (c) For any fiscal year in the event that the amount in the Budget Stabilization Fund exceeds 2% of the revenue limit established by subsection (a) of this Section, the General Assembly shall provide for distribution of the excess revenues in any of the three following methods; 1. Distribution to the various state pension funds established by law in proportion to the respective actuarial reserve deficiencies of the several funds based on the benefits in effect at the time of the effective date of this Section..."



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

Clerk O'Brien: "Funds distributed under this method shall be used only to produce (sic) (reduce) the actuarial reserve deficiencies of the various state pension funds; 2. Distribution for the retirement of outstanding general obligation bonds of the State. Funds distributed under this method shall not be used to pay current principal and interest charges, but shall only be used to retire outstanding general obligation bonds; and 3. Distribution in the form of the reducing or the rebating of State taxes. (d) There is hereby established a limit on the ad valorem taxes levied on real property by units of Local Government and School Districts. The total yield resulting from the application of the tax rate for any tax year to the assessed valuation of real property as finally equalized for that year, including (sic) (excluding) the value of new construction and improvements and property added by annexation, shall not be increased over the yield in the previous year in excess of 75% of the increase in the Consumer Price Index, all items for the United States, as defined and reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, or its successor agency, for the last full calendar year prior to the date the unit of Local Government or School District levies such taxes. If the total yield exceeds this limit the tax rate applied to the equalized assessed valuation shall be reduced to produce a yield which reflects no more than the limit established by this subsection. The revised tax rate shall then be applied to the equalized assessed valuation of new construction and improvements and property added by annexation. The limitation of this subsection shall not apply to taxes imposed for the payment of principal and interest on bonds or other evidence of indebtedness or for the payments of assessed (sic) (assessments) contract obligations in anticipation of which bonds are issued which were authorized prior to the effective



date of this Section. The limitations of this subsection shall apply to home rule units. The tax rate of a unit of Local Government or School District may be increased to yield revenue exceeding the limits established in this subsection only with the approval of the majority of the qualified electors of the unit of Local Government or School District voting thereon.

If such an increase... If such an increase is approved, then the total yield including the new tax rate shall be used to determine the limitation in the succeeding

year. (e) Whenever by law or by court order the responsibility for defraying the cost of a program is transferred from one unit of government to another unit of government, the total yield established by the Section for the unit of government to which such responsibility was transferred shall be commensurately increased and the total yield established by this Section for the unit of government from which such responsibility was transferred shall be commensurately decreased.

(f) The General Assembly shall by law prescribe the manner by which any unit of government or school district created after the effective date of this Section shall determine the limits established in subsection (d) of this Section during the first year of its existence. No new unit of Local Government or School District shall be created after the effective date of this Section, except by the approval of the majority of qualified electors of the proposed unit of Local Government or

School District voting thereon. (g) For any fiscal year that proportion of the state expenditures paid to all units of local government and school districts shall not be reduced below the proportion paid to all units of local government and school districts in fiscal year 1980. (h) The State shall appropriate funds for each unit of Local Government and School District to reimburse it for the full cost for mandates enacted after the effective date of this Section. However, where the General Assembly is required to enact legislation to comply with a federal mandate, the State shall exempt from the requirement of reimbursing a unit of Local Government or School District



for the cost of the mandate. State mandates for which funds are not appropriated to reimburse units of Local Government and School Districts are void until such time as the required funds are appropriated. No unit of Local Government or School District shall be required to implement any mandate enacted after the effective date of this Section unless that mandate is the result of a federal or court mandate or funds are appropriated for the unit of Local Government or School District for the cost of the mandate, as determined by the General Assembly. The limits established by subsection (d) of this Section shall not apply to new or expanded federal or court mandates. (i) Any taxes imposed to replace the revenue lost due to the abolishment of personal property taxes under subsection (c) of Section 5 of Article IX shall not be state taxes for the purpose of this Section and the proceeds from such taxes shall not be included in the computation under subsection (g) of this Section of the proportion of State expenditures distributed to units of Local Government and School Districts. (j) The General Assembly shall provide by law for the implementation of the provisions of this Section. Schedule. If approved by the electors, this Amendment takes effect July 1, next occurring after its adoption. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction and first Reading. This is what is known as hope springs eternal...in the human breast..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2787, Hallock-Leinenweber, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to frauds and prejudices. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "How many votes does it take to suspend the



Constitution so we can have immediate hearing on that Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's 236. I think."

Leinenweber: "I make that motion now."

Speaker Redmond: "Combined vote. Joint Session, 236."

Leinenweber: "I'll make that motion, then, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What.. What.. Was the Amendment? I wasn't.."

Leinenweber: "Well, it's a good Bill that somehow the Senate fouled up and failed to see.... "

Speaker Redmond: "Now. Now.. Now. Now. Heresy. How about a Constitutional Amendment to have the election of United States' Senators back in the Legislature?"

Leinenweber: "How about a petition for a Constitutional Convention to do that?"

Speaker Redmond: "On the Speaker's Table, House Joint.. Senate Joint Resolution 29. Representative Rea. Representative Rea, yes."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House... Joint.. Senate Resolution 29 has to do with the recovery of coal from coal refuse tailings that be... and that they be supported as means of energy conservation and of the utilization of fuel resources. The inclusion of coal recovery operations as surface mining and the regulations adopted by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement be questioned by the General Assembly. Inasmuch as the Federal Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 does not mention the recovery of coal from coal refuse piles as a surface mining operation, I'm asking in this Resolution that the General Assembly request of the United States Congress a clarification as to whether or not the recovery of coal from mine tailings is intended to be considered as surface mining operations. I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."



Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question on the Sponsor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hoffman: "What difference does it make?"

Rea: "At the present time of course we have lots of slurry and gob piles and under the Reclamation Act it does not clarify whether or not that the recovery of coal from these tailings are included and in order to .. in order to operate under the same operations as surface mining, we feel that this should be included."

Hoffman: "What..."

Rea: "It has the same provisions as .. and protection as what the surface mining operations would have."

Hoffman: "Alright. You're saying that now there is an effort to recover coal from tailings?"

Rea: "Yes. We.. There are many gob piles and slurry ponds and as a result, now there is much re... attempt has been made to recover the coal . And it's a high quality. It's.. Has less sulfur content. This will also create many more jobs in our area. It will help clean up the environment and so this is important that we get it clarified and that's all we're asking for."

Hoffman: "Okay. What.. What will it mean .. What will it mean in terms of what's happening or not happening now if it is clarified?"

Rea: "Well, it means that then we would have... It would clarify the provisions, the regulations, which are not.. we do not know what regulations we can operate under, presently because it's not clarified with any Act. It does not mention tailings in any way."

Hoffman: "Alright. These are federal regulations ..."

Rea: "Yes.. All we're asking for is a clarification.."

Hoffman: "This surface mining and underground are two different..."

Rea: "Yes. And this has to do with surface.. To find out if this is included within the surface mining."



Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Dunn: "Representative Rea, I don't know if I've seen the Resolution. I'm just reading the Synopsis here on the Calendar and is there any cost to this? What .. it's a Resolution that doesn't really do anything does it? Or does it not?"

Rea: "There is no cost to it whatsoever. All this does is ask for a clarification in terms of the Surface Mining Control Reclamation Office in Washington and we are appealing to the .. to the U.S. Department of the Interior for the purpose of this clarification."

Dunn: "Could you tell me is this supported by the Department of Mines and Minerals or Energy Commission or Energy Commission?"

Rea: "I didn't hear your question, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Alright. I'll restate it. The Department of Mines and Minerals favors this that tailings be included? Or have you talked to them about this or did Senator Johns?"

Rea: "Yes, they favored it and supported it in the Senate and it was voted out 100% with no dissenting vote."

Dunn: "I don't see anything wrong with it, but I'm just trying to.. trying .. I hadn't heard it, hadn't seen it, hadn't come across my desk or I missed it. Now does the Energy Commission support the concept too that we should count tailings in our coal energy reserves? Is that part of the Energy Commission or do you know?"

Rea: "The Energy Commission has been interested in this and yes, they have been exploring and promoting the use of these tailings."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think it's a good Resolution. I think it's worthy that we ask the Congress and ask the federal bureaucrats in Washington



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6-30-79

to help us with our energy problems and this is one little .. one little part of it. It sounds to me like it would be a good thing for us to do. The Senate passed it overwhelmingly and I urge that we adopt the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's absolutely nothing wrong with this Joint Resolution. It is an attempt to ask the OSM Office of Surface and Mining to determine whether this can or can not be included as part of the rules and regulations implementing public law 85-77, the new Surface Mining Act in Washington. We do no harm. We cost nothing. We are asking them to make a determination for us so we can determine whether the new technology that is being developed to reclaim this material from the tailings of mines is a practical matter. I would urge that we vote 'yes' on this Resolution. I don't know how much effect it will have, but at least it lets OSM in Washington know that we are trying to do everything we can to claim all of the energy reserves that we have available to us. I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 29. Those in favor say 'aye'. Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question I want to ask Representative Rea."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Birchler: "Would you be willing to put the other Representatives of the 58th and the 59th Districts as Cosponsors of this Resolution?"

Rea: "Yes. I would ask for leave to do so."

Birchler: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bower."



Bower: "Mr. Speaker, coal is very important in the 54th District. I'd like to have my name added as Cosponsor of the Resolution too."

Rea: "Fine. If I could have leave, any Members that would like to be added..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... Leave.. Leave to add everybody as Sponsor that wants to be Sponsor. Just come down and add your name to this. The question's on the motion for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 29. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. 64. Representative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would move that we suspend the rules for immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 64."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for immediate suspension of rule 64 (sic). Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 126 'aye' and no 'nay'. The motion carries. Representative Rea on Senate Joint Resolution 64."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Joint Resolution 64 which passed the Senate with no dissenting vote has to do with Section 125 of the Federal Clean Air Act which was enacted for the purpose of preventing any significant economic disruption or unemployment resulting from the use of coal or coal products other than the locally or regionally available coal products. Section 125 provides that the Governor of any State could convene hearings and if determined that a significant adverse impact would result from the transfer of a fuel source not based in the locality or region, order the continued use at locally or regionally available fuel for periods



up to ten years and order the acquisition of any additional means of emission limitation so as to.. so as to the result in compliance with the standards of the Federal Clean Air Act so long as the Governor had the written consent of the President. Section 125 has been amended to requiring that the Governor must petition the President to enter such an order. The intent of Section 125 is to prevent the provision of the Federal Clean Air Act from causing significant local or regional economic disruption or unemployment that has been changed by the Amendment. The State of Illinois, as you know, as a major coal producing state has realized a decline in the total production of coal since 1970 as a result of the provisions of the Federal Clean Air Act in part because Illinois coal is not being used by the electric generation industry which uses 80% of the domestic coal. The decline in production of Illinois coal accompanied by proportional declines in employment at the affected mines and the resulting loss of income among the miners and among those employed to transport the coal then produces an equivalent loss in income for those who provide goods and services and who are dependent upon the miners and transporters for a portion of their income as well as attracting the tax revenues of the local unit of government in which the affected mines is found and the tax revenues of the state. The two U.S. Senators from the State of Kentucky have introduced a Bill that would repeal Section 125 of the Federal Clean Air Act making it impossible for Governors to prevent the effects of complying with the.. with that Section 125. It's my hope that the 81st General Assembly should inform the Members through this Resolution of the Illinois Congressional delegation and advise them of our concern regarding the use of Illinois coal and the protection afforded it by the provision of Section



125. It's my hope that the Members of the Illinois delegation will be informed and that we will urge them to oppose any efforts to further weaken or eliminate the protection afforded by Section 125 of the Clean Air Act. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would allow that the other Representatives from the 58th and the 59th Districts and any other Representatives that want on it including Representative Bower who asked to be on the last one, be Cosponsors of this fine Resolution?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates there is no objection."

Dunn: "Fine. I think it's a fine Resolution. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an excellent Resolution. This is just a Resolution to help strengthen the coal industry, the economy of energy in the State of Illinois. It ties in with a Resolution that was passed by and adopted by both sides of this House.. House Joint Resolution 25, 6 and 7. It just says in a little bit different type of language... I would ask for a green votes in adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Senate Joint Resolution 64. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 433, Braun. 434, Stuffle-Redmond. 435, Ryan. 436, Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "The Chair recognizes Representative Giorgi. Representative Ebbesen, will you please sit down according to the rules?"



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 433 by Representative Braun congratulates the Jackson Park Hospital. 434 by Stuffle honors the Democratic pages of the House. 435 by Ryan honors James R. Goff. And 436 by .. by Alexander singles out Reverend Henry Cob for honors. And I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "You're heard the motion. Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Mautino, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I indeed have some sad news this morning. I was informed on the elevator that that one day war that started yesterday, the economic war with Wisconsin, Missouri and Kansas City we've suffered our first casualty. As I understand it, one day into the war, our Brigadier General was captured by the enemy from Missouri and I think that we should defer to a statement from our Leader on what has happened in that particular combat area."

Speaker Redmond: "Field Marshall? Field Marshall Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do bring sad news. Although glad tidings at the end. I was taken prisoner last night by the Kansas cavalry working through a devious source known as Ozark Airlines. And after a four hour plane delay in Chicago I was held captive all night in a devious prisoner exchange area called, 'John's Lounge'. It was only through cunning on my own part this morning reciting a few special names that are thought in high reverence over at John's namely the Lieutenant Governor, that I not only was released, but I was kicked out of the place. So I'm back with you today hoping that I can serve my great state and the grand



army of Illinois for the next day or two. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer, I wonder if you realize that in the last Session we passed a law repealing the law which made it mandatory to stay in John's Lounge until they close. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Field Marshall Griesheimer, at John's Lounge would you say that chemical warfare entered into your capture?"

Griesheimer: "It did indeed, because they just cleaned the mens' room and the smell was overpowering."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to suggest that the Praire Fox should visit the Senate to seek their receding from their Amendment on the POW license plate Bill so that the Praire Fox can have POW licenses plates on his car next year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, have you done your stint? How about on the Order of Motions? House... A motion with respect to House Bill 2378, Representative Giorgi. Giorgi, 2378? Representative Griesheimer?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 2378 I was the House Sponsor of this Bill. That's the Department of Conservation Bill. The Bill was concurred in last night and I was drawn off the floor of the House. Representative Getty found an error in the Bill and in order to cover our flank here, Representative Giorgi filed a motion to reconsider. I certainly concur in that at this point in time and would urge the House to move to reconsider the motion by which we concurred in House Bill 2378."

Speaker Redmond: "You move to reconsider the vote, is that correct?"

Giorgi: "That's right."

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



to reconsider the vote by which the Senate Amendment #2 was concurred and adopted to House Bill 2378. Those in favor indicated by saying 'aye', 'aye'. I'd better take a Roll Call. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120... 130 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the House does.. The motion carries. Now Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would now move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 2378 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "I would move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur in Senate Amendment to the House Bill 2378. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. And the House non-concurs in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2378. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, there's another motion up there to reconsider on House Bill 2377. It's exactly the same problem that we had on 2378. I should have had them both heard together. I would move or concur in the motion that has been filed by Representative Giorgi to reconsider the vote by which we concurred in Senate Amendment to House Bill 2377."

Speaker Redmond: "2377. Representative Giorgi, having voted on the prevailing side, moves to reconsider the vote by which Senate Amendment 1 was concurred in and adopted. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I want to know what it's all about. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're in the



House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2377. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. And the House non-concurs. House Joint Resolution 32. Representative McGrew. No, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. 956. Where is that one, Representative McGrew?"

McGrew: "On Concurrence, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh. On the Order of Concurrence, I was wrong on that. 956, Senator (sic) McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to 956. I think we have to take them seperately. Amendment #... Well, the Bill, as it left the House, provided that the assistant principals could become the acting principal for a year in the cases where the principal was incapacitated or could not continue. Senate #1... Senate Amendment #1 was a limitation of that, 50 days, I believe and it was just a minor restriction. Frankly was one that I concurred in and I would ask for the House to move to concur in Senase Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the motion on 1, Mr. McGrew?"

McGrew: "Concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 956. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 3 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 956. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "And now, Mr. Speaker, I would move noncon.. the House do not concur in Senate Amendment #2. Frankly, it was a very good Amendment, but this is the continuing education for CPA's and I don't think we want to address



closing day of the Session. My seatmate tells me there's an error in the Bill. Now, that's not enough for me today. I'm going to insist today that we be a little more careful in what we do because I'll tell you, I get these rumblings as people run down the aisle that a train may be coming down the track. And I think that even if it takes me... give my seatmate a little more time on something and on other Bills that come along the aisle that we'd better take some more time being more deliberative because that's what it's going to take. Otherwise, something may go right by us and we'll never know what it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my thespian friend used the microphone to ask the question, I'll use the microphone to answer it. We don't know who's going to be reading for the academy awards around here. But you know how he's been a jealous guarder of our freedom and what we're trying to correct is allowing searches and seizures without a warrant, John. I'm sure you're against that. And you'll be for the reconsideration."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Amendment 1 was concurred in and adopted. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. It requires 89 votes. Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye' and 2 'no'. The motion carries. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would now move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment to House Bill 2377 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed. Mr. Speaker, I'd further request if possible that the Conference Committee be appointed jointly for House Bill 2377 and '78. The situation is identical on the two Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer moves that the



21.

it in this legislation. So I would move nonconcurrence."
Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur
in Senate Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye';
opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries.
The House nonconcurrs in Senate Amendment 2 to House
Bill 956. "



Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Concurrence House Bill 229.
Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it's a shame that this is what passes for a taxpayers Bill this year because it's not very much. This is the Bill that eliminates the requirement that down-state taxpayers who pay their taxes under protest pay \$10 per tax Bill to the Circuit Clerk. The Senate has added what I consider a trivial and superfluous Amendment saying that the tax objections have to be filed by the taxpayer. That is so significant I move for concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Move to concur, Representative Skinner?
Representative Skinner, your motion was concur. Is that right?"

Skinner: "Yes. Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion the House concur, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Skinner: "Always."

Getty: "Does this apply to Cook County, Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "The reason for the Bill is because taxpayers in Cook County do not now have to pay \$10 per tax Bill that they pay under protest and for some reason taxpayers down-state have to do so. It does not apply to Cook County."

Getty: "I refer you to page 6, line 30. Is there anything in that line that could be interpreted as applying to Cook County?"

Skinner: "As far as I can figure out, there isn't. The problem was that down-state, and this of course is in the original Bill and has nothing to do with the Amendment, the taxes had to be paid under protest in advance basically. One had to pay the first installment and the second installment at the first installment due date and that just does not seem fair. It doesn't seem fair that one should have to come up with the money ahead of time that you don't think you ought to be paying in the first place."



Getty: "In Cook County you only pay the second installment under protest in order.."

Skinner: "... has nothing to do with Cook County as far as I'm concerned."

Getty: "Alright. Well with that legislative intent in the record, I hope that clears up any problem."

Skinner: "Got that Supreme Court?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "If the Sponsor'd yield for one question.. Cal, in the case of the Senate Amendment, what is the situation ... the case of where property is held in trust? Who files the objection?"

Skinner: "Well, generally the bank does... the trust company does."

Simms: "The trust.. the holder of the trust or the beneficiary?"

Skinner: "Sure. They're the taxpayer. I think they put it in because they.. they don't.. this is in one of our staff analyses and it's as good a guess as any behind the intent and that is that they didn't want to charge tax Districts who wanted... I don't know how a tax District can pay taxes under protest, but.."

Simms: "I don't either.."

Skinner: "Yeah, well..."

Simms: "My concern is that with trust.."

Skinner: "Oh, it's the Senate Sponsor standing next to you. Senator Schaefer, why don't you answer Representative Simms' question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Simms, do you have.."

Simms: "My question's been answered."

Speaker Matijevich: "Anything further? Representative Skinner to close."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I ask concurrence on this fairly limited tax relief Bill. It doesn't do much and that's a very large commentary of this Session."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Skinner moves that the House does



concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 265 (sic).. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'... Oh.. 229 rather. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?"

Skinner: "Happy tax protesting."

Speaker Matijevich: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'ayes', no 'nays', no present and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 229. House Bill 2034, the Speaker of the House, I believe, wants that one called. Speaker Redmond, are you there or not? Where are you at? Alright. Then we'll go to.. we'll go to 2168. We've got a few listed right here. I've been asked to call first. 2168. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2168. House Bill 2168 is a products liability Bill that was an agreed Bill coming out of the House and agreed in the Senate. This is a technical Amendment. It combines the new cause... combining sentences. I know of no opposition. I believe it's all agreed to and I would seek your favorable support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels, moves that the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2168. There's no discussion. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye', no 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2168. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I thought I had moved



to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1914 and I see now that's on concurrence on today's Calendar. And I wonder if we could nonconcur in that now so when you get going with a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright. Representative Yourell moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1914. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 1914. Is Speaker Redmond on the floor yet? Oh. Oh, you want your Bill heard from over there, Mr. Speaker? What? Alright. House Bill 1564. Ben Polk, the Gentleman from Rock Island. Ben Polk, 1564."

Polk: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move we concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1564. The Amendment that was placed on there simply says that as per requested that pursuant to contract between the commercial locator and the property owner something that Howie Carroll felt was necessary and not too meaningful, but I will concur."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Polk moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1564. If there's no discussion, those in favor signify by .. signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'aye', 2 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1564. On the Order of Concurrence on page, House Bill 265. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House do not concur with Senate. nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 265."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Kosinski moves that the House do not concur with Senate Amendment #1 to



House Bill 265. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed 'no'. And the House does not concur.. nonconcur with Senate Amendment # 1 to House Bill 265. House Bill 1763, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Amendment #1 of House Bill 1763 defines the number of hours that a peace officer must have for his .. before they determine that he is actually a full time police officer. And they placed that as 200 hours per year by any county or municipality. And I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Polk moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1763. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye', no 'nay', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1763. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, for what purpose do you arise?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, point of privilege. It wasn't but a half an hour ago when you were in your chair that you got up and said today is the day the railroad comes and you insisted that every Member explain everything. Now you have taken the Chair and things have changed considerably. You're running these things through so fast, we don't have time to go through our files and find out what's going on. Now, would you get back in the caboose and help us so that the railroad doesn't go through?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I feel heartened at least that some downstaters are meeting in the Speaker's Office and I have a feeling that maybe by the time they get out of there they'll realize that those promises



that the DOT made to them are empty promises and maybe that'll slow things down. Hopefully. Well, they're going to have a meeting in the Speaker's Office shortly I know."

Totten: "Well, could you give us.."

Speaker Matijevich: "On the floor?.."

Totten: " Could you give us a chance to at least have somebody explain these things?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. We'll do that. House Bill 1255. Representative Bowman... er.. Donovan."

Donovan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Amendment #1 has been ruled nongermane and so I move to ask nonconcurrence on the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1255."

Speaker Matijevich: "How about 2, Donovan?"

Donovan: "I want to move concurrence on the Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to .. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "In accordance with your request, when you were in your seat several minutes ago, I wonder whether the Gentleman would please explain what the Amendment does that we're nonconcurring in?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He said it was nongermane.."

Pullen: "Well, he didn't..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, proceed and tell us why it was not nongermane."

Donovan: "It doesn't deal with the proper code, I understand. And so it was ruled that way."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves nonconcurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1255. Those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the House does not concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1255. And now we're on Senate Amendment #2."



Donovan: "Senate Amendment #2 adds a third paragraph to my Bill which... which states it makes it a .. an offense unlawful to sell or manufacture a card that... let's see... Oh, that it entitles them to receive public aid benefits. Makes it unlawful if you manufacture or sale... or fraudulent card that would entitle a public aid recipient to receive benefits."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1255. The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, are you on this issue?"

Robbins: "I was just wondering if since he explained it, I'm willing to vote for it, but if not... it wasn't in our Digest over here. So I wanted to know exactly what it was."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye', no 'nay', 2 answering 'present'. And the Senate (sic) does concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill 1255. Senate Amendment 2. At Bill Laurino's desk, we have House Bill 2034. The Speaker of the House, Bill Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when House Bill 2034 was originally introduced it was because of a peculiarity in the way in which the billing of transportation by Members on state planes was handled. It had been absorbed by the Department of Transportation. We were advised that starting July 1st, they were going to charge the account of House operations and I had a check made and that runs about \$5,000 a month and at the same time, the Transportation allowance of Members is an appropriation as I understand it to the Comptroller and if they billed it



to the House Operations the monies appropriated to the Comptroller would lapse. So this Bill was introduced for thought that if a Member did in fact travel a state plane that the proper travel appropriation would be charged rather than House Operations. Quite frankly there is not fifty or sixty thousand dollars to spare in House Operations. That was the purpose of introducing the Bill in the first place. When it went over to the Senate, Senator Wootendecreases the home office allowance of the Members of the Legislature from \$17,000 to \$20,000. He asked me if that Amendment was acceptable. My feeling on that is that that's a decision that has to be made by the Members. If they desire to have the home office allowance increased from 17 to 20 thousand dollars I.. that does that. It provides for it in the Senate Amendment. Therefore, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2034."

Speaker Matijevich: "Speaker Redmond moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 234, (sic). Want to clear the Board, Jack? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with all due respect to the Sponsor, who I think is legitimately trying to put before us in as unbiased a way as the system permits a question that concerns us all. I rise in opposition to this motion to concur. I don't think that the office allowance is something that's abused. As a matter of fact, I think it's used in most senses for the benefit of the constituency. And it really is a service to our constituents. But I'm rising in opposition for a reason that I think some may not accept, but I think we all understand. And that is, we've gone through over the course of the last...."

Speaker Matijevich: "For one moment. The Gentleman from



Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you arise?"

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the time to interject the point of order here. Inasmuch as Representative Johnson has the floor while he's explaining his opposition to this Bill, he could explain to us why he won't vote to pay his own wages and why he won't vote to pay for the expenses of this House that he could take so much time up in Enrolling and Engrossing and in the transcripts and then everything else. You might explain that while you're on the floor, Mr. Johnson. Why you refuse to vote for your own wages and for the expenses of this House. I have both Roll Calls in front of me."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Continue, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "If Representative Giorgi wants to turn this into a debate, I was trying to talk to the issue in a rational way. But if he wants to get in the business of making personal attacks then I'll answer the question. Answer the question by saying that when we are talking to the people of Illinois about saving their taxes, when we're talking to the people of Illinois about abusing their expenses... I'll take it easy here. When we're talking to the people of Illinois about how we're trying to save their taxes..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Giorgi is going wild here. What do you need?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, he refuses to vote for the Roll Call. Now I have two Roll Calls in front of me. Senate Bill 938 and Senate Bill 937. One is for the wages of the Members of the House... and one is for the up-keep of the House... He voted 'no' on both of them..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment Representative Giorgi. I've got a point of order. Just hang onto those Roll Calls



For the future. Okay. Continue, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well I don't know what those Bills are, but if they're Bills to... What are they? Representative Giorgi, you might as well tell me what they are. What are the issues?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No, he's already out of order. Don't ask what they are. Proceed."

Johnson: "Well, I really ought to respond, but I think the debate over the pay raise is one that the people of Illinois understand. If Representative Giorgi wants to go on record as ripping off the people that's his own business. But as to this... The issue that's before us ... Alright. I'll yield to the rip-off."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. He wants to hear what you'll say. I guess he does want to make this a debate. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, and while he has the floor, would he please explain to the House, he's filed 69 motions to change his vote when no one will notice it by June 30th. Have him explain that while he's on the floor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, for what purpose do you arise?"

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just was waiting to speak after the Gentlemen were through debating."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Johnson, we're back to you."

Johnson: "Representative Giorgi, due to sufficient opportunities I suppose I ought to confine my remarks to House Bill 2034. Looked at the number of Bills we introduced respectively...."

Speaker Matijevich: "I hope there's this much excitement over the transportation package.."

Johnson: "I think we're in a posture now of having to vote on something soon after we've had a terrific public



outcry about a pay raise. And I think that while the office expense is something that's used in a generally beneficial sense to the people and it's something that's far more justifiable in my mind than those other things that have been alluded to, I think that this year is a bad year to do it. And I think it's a bad year to go back to the home district or even to answer people .. to people generally that while this is in a different posture, and it's in a different voucher... in a vouchered expense rather than a pay sense, it's just not something that we could go back and explain very well and keep our credibility for the people who've sent us down here to save money. So I would suggest that while the Sponsor, Speaker Redmond, is certainly well intentioned, and while this Bill is something that's not used in the same sense that a salary pay increase is, that this year is not the year to do it and that we ought to wait till.. till a future time when I think inflation and the other factors that affect the office allowance have caught up with it sufficiently that we can.. that we can vote for this in better conscience. So I would urge albeit the Sponsor's good intention of this that we vote 'no' on this motion to concur."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's always a pleasure to hear an intelligent discussion on a Bill. It certainly helps us come to a reasonable conclusion. I might add that in all the years I've been in the House, I have never utilized my entire allocation. But I don't believe that that applies to many of my colleagues. I think that many of them have need of these funds. I think that many of them... I know that many of them perform services in great, great more demand than I do. I know they're



called upon on many occasions to bring.. to pay for these services out of their own pocket. I think that this is a proposition that is certainly needed and I urge a favorable vote in favor of this Bill."

Speaker Matjevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, The Assistant Majority Leader, Jim Taylor. Taylor."

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

Speaker Matjevich: "Representative Taylor moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. And the Speaker of the House, Bill Redmond, to close."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this matter is something that I don't have any personal interest in because I lapse better than \$10,000 from the \$17,000 that's allotted to me. It was put on to afford the Members an opportunity to receive the additional \$3,000 if they felt they needed it. And I would like to emphasize the fact that this expense is singularly in the control of each Member. If he doesn't need it, he doesn't have to spend it. Therefore I would suggest that your conscience be your guide. I intend to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2034."

Speaker Matjevich: "Speaker Redmond moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 234. (sic). Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, one of the few things we have that brings us close to the voters back home and over 200 miles away in my case is the District Office. It's the most misunderstood expense. It's the most necessary expense. I don't criticize the press much, but the press



has a way of adding our home office expenses to our salaries. Actually that money is vouchered out directly to the landlord, the telephone company, the secretary. We never see that money or those checks. It would be like adding the Governor's secretary and office expense to his salary. It's definitely vouchered out to those who use it. It's needed. It brings us closer to the people. I'm not ashamed to get up here and go back in my District and run on a \$3,000 increase per year in home office expense and I support the Speaker in his motion to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2034."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, to explain his vote."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly concur with what the previous Speaker has said about the necessity of a good home office operation because you're very close to the people. I concur with the Speaker in the fact that some people probably don't need \$17,000 or \$20,000 to run their home office and others may need more. The thing that really bothers me in this whole situation is here we are in the closing hours of this Session putting through an increase in our legislative allowance. It seems to me that we could do these things well up front and not incur the wrath of the general public at the moment we're talking about sales tax increases and things like that. Now we had an opportunity here a few weeks ago to vote on this type of thing, not to allow us to raise our salaries between the time we are elected and the time we take office. And what happened? ere hung out to dry on that measure. Leadership didn't give us an opportunity for the Membership to really vote on it. These are the things that the people back home don't like. And this type of thing



must be stopped. And therefore, I'm forced to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski, one minute to explain his vote."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I lapse 8 to 10 thousand dollars. I use my jewelry business as my office. I do not reflect any expenses to the State so this is of no great interest to me. But I've heard..heard so many complaints from Members in the General Assembly who do have office expenses,, rising costs of such rental, problems with personnel, that I am voting for this measure."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt, to explain his vote. One minute."

Bluthardt: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to oppose the concurrence motion. You know, it was only about ten years ago we had no expense allowances whatsoever. We got along real well. Since we've had the expense accounts, what we've done is encourage the research and the production of more and more Bills so that we're now voting on around 4,000 Bills during the Session. If we raise the.. er.. increase the allowance, we're going to be voting on about 8,000 because they're going to hire more and more researchers and find and more and more Bills to file. It..also encourages full time Legislators who can't find another job and I think the full time Legislator is probably the poorest Legislator there is, insofar as representing the people of Illinois. I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ray Ewell. One minute to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, there are two ways to be a Legislator. You can be an up-front Legislator, stand up for what you believe, vote for what you believe, put yourself on the record, and that's what the Sponsor did in this



particular case. He has labored on our behalf as the House in the face of criticism to raise us to a decent standard of able to become the kind of Legislators we ought to be. It is cowardice for us to sit down in our seats and slyly snivel and hope that somebody will put 89 votes on it so we can walk back to the Districts and say look what I am, a Legislator who fought for a \$3,000 increase per Legislator. But where are you same Legislators when it comes time to taking out pork for your District? You're there, voting every single Bill that you can find. You can't have it both ways."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook.... er.. Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I was one of the first Legislators to open up an office. I've got ABC television, CBS and NBC stopping in my office every day. I have the Gannette and news chain stopping in my office everyday. I have WROK, WRR. I pay \$135 a month's rent, 125 for telephone, hardly any miscellaneous expenses, \$10,000 for help and I can't break even on \$17,000. I defy anyone to check my vouchers to find a dime that's illegally spent or spent foolishly. And I challenge the news media in my District to tell the story like it is. My office is an extension of the Unemployment Office, the Public Aid Office, the Public Health Office, the Department of Transportation Office, the Governor's Office, and everywhere else. Anybody that isn't operating their office at full bent like I am is deluding his ... cheating his public and not earning his keep here and I appreciate some of those guys not voting for their pay raise, cause they're not earning it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Willer, to explain her vote."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm very proud of my full time



District Office and I'm very proud of the fact that I'm a full time Representative. I don't have any conflicts of interest in my business whether I'm a village official have voting on legislation that favors villages. I don't have that conflict. I'm not in insurance. I'm not in law. I'm happy to be a full time Representative and very proud of my office. My rent has gone up. My utilities have gone up. I'm down to one newsletter a year because the postage.. Anyone can check my vouchers too. My office is an open office in more ways than one and I support this raise." SLOPP!

Speaker Matijewich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti. One minute."

Conti: "Mr.. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's nothing wrong. If I can have the attention of the House, there's nothing wrong with voting for a Bill at this time of the year that's seven months before. six months before you file your petition to run for reelection. I campaigned on the issue that Legislators should be paid more. I campaigned on the issue that if I came down here I was going to increase the salary of Legislators. I campaigned on the caliber of Legislators you would get if you would pay them more and I didn't get one single tea bag, I didn't get one letter, I got two letters. One from Ed Bluthardt's District and the other one came from Streator, Illinois about my pay raise. In the last 3 years that I've been down here I've used \$8,000 of my office expense. I'm one of the fortunate ones, I don't need it. My house on Sunday mornings is my headquarters back home. My home telephone number is my headquarters and I don't take any expenses at all with \$8,000 in the last 3 years. I turned all my money back to the State. But there are less fortunate Legislators in this House that this is all that they have. And this is all that they can



get to run their office. This is necessary for the legislators who are trying to work and trying to do a job for the constituents back home and let's not be pusillanimous about this.. Let's put an 'aye' vote up there."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie. One minute to explain her vote."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm voting 'yes' for this concurrence. It seems to me Representative Giorgi hit the nail on right on the head. Many of us are serving our constituents. It's an expensive operation. Those of you who want to grandstand in the press about how you're saving the taxpayers money, you don't need to vote 'no' on this Bill. You can vote 'yes' on this Bill for those of us who do need the additional increment For yourselves, you can get plenty of publicity back home. Tell the newspapers how much of the money allotted to your district service operation you have lapsed. If you only need \$8,000, return the additional. Put out a press release. Let the people of the state know that you are saving the taxpayers real dollars. You're not serving them perhaps as well as you might, but you're saving them real money. But don't make it impossible for those of us who need that additional money to go on serving our people."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson. One minute to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to suggest that if we're really interested in tax relief. Here's an excellent opportunity to provide a little bit for our constituents, even possibly at some personal disadvantage to us. This may be one of the few forms of tax relief we pass out of this real tax relief we pass out of this House this year. I don't know. But I do know that the cost



of government is what is costing... causing the tax payers their distress. And I think that this is an opportunity to keep the escalating costs of government down and therefore, indirectly if not directly, provide the taxpayers some small relief. So I can .. I can vote 'no' on this measure and in good conscience. "

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman. One minute to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's sad that a lot of people here are gun shy as a result of the pay raise vote last year. There are two big differences between this vote and that one. The first difference is that this money does not go into out pocket. Not one nickel of it goes into our pocket. It goes to serve our constituents directly. How many of you voted for that pay increase, went back to your constituents and said, we need this money, additional pay because we're.. the volume of work is greater in Springfield, we're working harder than ever before? Well, if we're working harder than ever before, it seems to me this is a litmus test. We've got to be able to fund that. The second point .. or the second difference is that this is before a filing date for nominating petitions. We're doing this up front. The last point I'd like to make is that right now the average lapse, the average lapse of the contingent expense allowance is \$3,000 per Legislator. That means...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger, one minute to explain her vote."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I serve two counties that want services. I have one office in Springfield and one office in Nokomis. The two salaries come to \$14,400, the rent to another \$1800 and I can't make my home my office. I live 20 miles



out in the country. I want to know who will come out there? I'm willing to subsidize the state. I've been paying money out of my own pocket for it, but I think if there's an opportunity for us to continue this service I should not be subsidizing the state in order to give my constituents the kind of service they need and want."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, one minute to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have voted red on this. I can see that several of you do need the raise. I'm going to be able to turn back a little money to my district because I have maintained one office with a part time secretary and we have accomplished quite a bit for the district. So you will see that I am willing to change to 'yes' whenever I feel like that I.. the people want me to vote 'no', but we need to be able to do what we have to do to work to try to get the TRA back .. money back for the people and to try to get something done for those that are not receiving proper workmen compensation from the State of Illinois. "

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, to explain his vote."

Greiman: "Well, when we began this debate I was torn between a courageous 'present' or a reluctant 'no'. And after listening to some of the debate and seen who's gotten up, I pulled down my scorecard that I've been keeping here and I found the same people who voted to give tax exemptions to foreign insurance companies tax exemptions to fancy private clubs, decrease the size of inter-state trucks, give tax exemptions to out of state printers, destroyed the collections for out of state income earned in Illinois, those same people are talking about.. piously about saving the taxpayers money. Where were you then? Where were you when we were



letting all kinds of exemptions slip by this House for industry and for business? All of you just weren't listening maybe. And now on this one though, we'll have a little flagellation, right? We'll have a little masochism. We'll beat ourselves to death. I was going to be courageous and vote 'present'. I'm going to be more sensible and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon, to explain his vote."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, when I first came to this General Assembly we received the \$50.00 allowance for two years. Of course, we only worked six months in that two year period. In addition to that our salary was \$6,000 a year. The House of Representatives served the people very well then. However, we are in a new era. People wish to consult with their Legislators. Some of you need an office. Some of you need the expenses. I'm going to lapse in excess of \$3,000 for the first six months of this year, but I am going to vote 'yes' for those who need it. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "Have all voted? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn, to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, it won't take me a minute, but I've got to say to you that I'm voting 'aye' in spite of the fact that I turned back anywhere from 10,000 to 13,000. I guess I spend less on the home office expense allowance than anybody on this floor, but I do recognize that some of the districts have got as high as ten counties and I've got a small one. I don't need the money and I don't spend it. But I am going to vote 'aye' cause there are a lot of people on this floor that do need the money and they're spending their own money."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Deuster, from Lake, to



explain his vote. Deuster. "

Deuster: " Well, like Representative Oblinger, for a while I tried to run my legislative office out of my home and most people could not find their way out to Silvan Lake so I rented an office in Mundelein I found that the rent has gone up. The office expenses have gone up. I think it is possible for us to adequately fund the office expenses that we have and at the same time give the people what they really want and that is tax relief. We have passed out of this General Assembly a repeal of the sales tax on food and drugs. I've found in talking to my people that they don't begrudge us a legitimate reimbursement for our actual expenses in serving the public so long as at the same time we listen to them and give them the tax relief that they believe in and that they want and they desperately need. We have through carefully budgeting I believe, provided tax relief for the people at the same...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted? Headed in the wrong direction. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 79 'aye', 88 'no', 4 voting 'present'. Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to emphasize the fact that this meant absolutely nothing to me because I lapsed over \$10,000. In the event... the average lapse now is about \$3,000. So if everybody would spent the 17, the total amount of money we're talking about would be exactly the same. But I defer to the wishes of the majority of the House here. I didn't like this Amendment to be on my Bill, quite frankly, but it was the only vehicle. Therefore I move that we..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, for before we do that, the motion to concur fails.. nonconcur fails and now the Speaker.."



Speaker Redmond: "I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Marijevich: "Moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2034. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 (sic) to House Bill 2034. The House Bill 1010, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are three Amendments. Senate Amendment 1 is a technical Amendment and I would move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1010."

Speaker Marijevich: "Representative Katz moves to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1010. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action."

Katz: "Alright, Mr. Speaker, I will now..."

Speaker Marijevich: "Just a minute. Have all voted? Have all voted? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton, to explain your vote? No? Alright. Point of order."

Cullerton: "When you have a concurrence and there's more than one Amendment, you're going to concur on one and nonconcur on others, it's all going to go into a Conference Committee anyway. Correct?"

Speaker Marijevich: "Well, not necessarily. That will show the Conference Committee that we have.. this is locked in. That part of it is locked in. That's.."

Cullerton: "But it's not really locked in is it?"

Speaker Marijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook... One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is if the House concurs with Amendments 2 and 3, the Senate may still recede from 1 and that's why."

Speaker Marijevich: "That's right. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 134 'aye', no 'nay', 7 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to



House Bill 1010. Now the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3. I hope and expect the Senate to recede from those Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1010. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay' and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1010. House Bill 1804, the Chairman of Appropriations II Committee, Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we acted on 1804 the other day but through an error by the Senate they had sent over the wrong message. So we have to go back through it again. This is one of the Bills of the package of the safety and security on the mass transit system. This Bill deals with training of employees. Senate Amendment 1 make a clear definition and insure we're only dealing with mass transit carriers and excluding intra-state carriers. Senate Amendment #2 sets out certain procedures relative to the program. I would move that we would concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to House Bill 1804."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mautino, you want to come up here for a moment? The Gentleman moves that we ... the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1804. There's no discussion. The question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1804?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'aye', 1 'no', and 6



voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1804. The .. House Bill 2750, the Lady from Cook, Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendmen t #1. It's just a tightening up of some language that DCFS required on the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2750. There's no discussion. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this ... The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman, are you seeking attention on this? No? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'aye', no 'nay', no 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2750. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my problem was that in looking up the Bill numbers so fast, I had Bill #2570 whereas you had called 2750 and once again I'd like to renew the request that when the Sponsors call for a motion they just give us at least a very brief description of what the Bill does. Because many times we're voting on issues and we don't even know what it is and it's been stated so many times on the floor but yet Sponsors continue to fail to do that. And I would ask you to please see to it that the Sponsors do give some brief description on what kind of Bill we're voting on."

Speaker Matijevich: "Your point is in order. On the Order of Nonconcurrency is Senate Bill 289. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #2 and that



we request that a Conference Committee be formed to resolve the differences of the two Houses."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty moves to refuse to recede ... One moment. Do you want to explain that to the Gentleman?"

Getty: "This is Representative Friedrich's Amendment. We put on that has to do with furloughs from the state institutions."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, my point, Representative, is that it would be helpful if Sponsors would explain first of all what kind of a Bill we're dealing with."

Getty: "This is the Bill having to do with..."

Schuneman: "We're not as familiar with each Bill as the Sponsor himself might be and that's my point."

Getty: "Well, I thought it was in the Journal. This is the Bill that would permit the courts to impose in addition to other sanctions a house arrest sort of sanction to confine a person within a fixed place subject to order of the court. That Bill passed out of here with a very resounding vote. Representative Friedrich had an Amendment in this House on a Bill that .. that failed due to other circumstances. He asked to use that as a vehicle. I agreed with him that we ought to do that. It addresses itself to a problem that the Department of Corrections had. We amended it. The Senate saw fit not to concur. I think we can resolve the problem in a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty moves to refuse to recede from House Am... Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 289. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed 'no', and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Amendment (sic) 289. And requests a Conference Committee. The Gentleman from



Sangamon, Representative Kane, on House Bill 672."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 672. House Bill 672 is a state fair Bill and the Amendment is a technical Amendment which changes 'pollution' which was put in there inadvertently to 'project.' And I would ask the House to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kane moves to concur .. that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 672. On that, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Since we've had several state fair Bills in this Session and this is .. this does constitute final passage, I wonder whether the Gentleman could briefly describe the Bill."

Kane: "This is the good Bill. This is the one that puts the state... puts the state fair under a separate Commission and requires the state fair to become fiscally responsible within three years."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the House... The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, could you please tell me why we're allowing the state fair to issue bonds?"

Kane: "These are ... These are revenue bonds and the only Amendment is a technical Amendment which changes pollution to project. It was an inadvertant error when the Bill went through."

Skinner: "Well, are we in effect setting up another toll way authority?"

Kane: "No."

Skinner: "If they sell any bonds?"

Kane: "No. This was all in the Bill before when it went out of the House the first time."

Skinner: "I know it was in the Bill before, but, you know, the first time through sometimes everybody doesn't get



everything that's in the Bill. I think the pay as you go concept is laudable, but I'm not sure that I want the state fair to be totally independent of the Legislature which I believe they would if we once issued bonds any more than I want the RTA to be independent of the Legislature if they once issue bonds."

Kane: "No, I think that they would still have to answer to us. We still would control their statutory authority."

Skinner: "How much are we losing a year on the state fair now?"

Kane: "Last year was about a million three."

Skinner: "Well, I guess I'll make that minor concession. We can have another toll way authority if we can save that kind of money."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the other night Doug Kane took after the Springfield Metropolitan Exposition Authority and I'm sure that probably most of the agricultural premium fund in downstate expenditures expended in the Springfield area and now you tell me now we're going to use agricultural premium funds to guarantee the revenue bonds issued by the state fair authority? What's the difference between that and helping the Springfield Metropolitan Exposition Authority with their deficiency from the same fund? If there is a difference."

Kane: "No, Representative Giorgi, I think you have this all wrong. What this is is an Amendment to a separate state fair Commission which would take over the state fair. They would not use agricultural premium funds except for prizes and premiums. They would have nothing at all to do with the bonds that are mentioned in this Amendment."

Giorgi: "How are the bonds going to be retired?"

Kane: "By revenue of ... created or generated by the state fair."



Giorgi: "Is there a guarantee or back up guarantee?"

Kane: "No."

Giorgi: "In the event you don't make it."

Kane: "No."

Giorgi: "What if they run as inefficiently as they've proven to be in the past?"

Kane: "Then they wouldn't be able to float any bonds. Nobody would buy them."

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

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if we vote to concur on this we are creating a Commission. We are giving them control of these funds for the state fair. We are giving them the right to run the state in debt and take away money from the funds and we are giving the Commission total control of what we should try to control ourselves. If we don't want to try to control ourselves, why don't we let .. just hire a Commission to run the state and let them issue the bonds?"

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

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield? Doug? Question; what is the cost? What is this going to cost? I noticed they ... Our synopsis states that they.. finance solely after July 1st, 1983, the authority shall be financed solely from the revenues derived from the state fair. But until that, what is it going to cost per year approximately?"

Kane: "Well, if this concept is adopted and we've already passed this Bill, it wouldn't have any cost to the state. "

Piel: "No, I'm talking in reference to the bond liability."

Kane: "There wouldn't be any state ... state liability for the bonds. This would be simply if the state fair



authority would have the authority to issue revenue bonds that would be supported solely from revenue derived by the state fair from state fair activities."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Minority Spokesman on the State Government Organization Committee which has considered the state fair problem, I rise to support Representative Kane on this motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 672. I have some problems with the concept and I've expressed them throughout the debate. But we've spent more time than I care to remember. I personally spent more time than I care to remember on the state fair this year. We have sent to the Governor's desk a Bill which I sponsored and Senator Graham sponsored. It will put the state fair back under the Department of Agriculture, but I think the debate goes unresolved as to absolutely the best approach. I think we ought to put this Bill also on the Governor's desk and let the Governor make the final decision. It seems to me that Representative Kane has worked very hard on this. He's worked very closely with our side of the aisle on this issue. We've done a good job in considering these Bills and putting them in the shape they should be. I would urge all the Members on my side of the aisle and all the Members in the chamber to support Representative Kane in concurring on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones..... Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to move the previous question too but I do want to concur on the previous statement that Representative Kane and I..."



Speaker Matijevich: "... I'm sorry. I didn't know Representative Jones was moving the previous question. Alright. I'd better go to that. Representative Jones moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and the main question shall be put. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just ask the House to concur in this technical Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kane moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 672. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'aye', 10 'nay', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 672. Representative Kane on House Bill 921."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask the House to concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 921. House Bill 921 is the Bill which implements the Governor's executive reorganization power under the 1970 Constitution. What the Amendment... What the Senate Amendment does is clarify when the... when an executive order is delivered to the Legislature and it also lists all of the procedural Acts which the Legislature has passed which apply to State Government organizations and agencies that any new agency created by the Governor under a Reorganization Act or order would have to comply with and I would urge the adopt... the concurrence in Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kane moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 921. If there's no discussion, the... Those in favor



signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'aye', 3 'nay', 2 answering 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 921. House Bill 1901, Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2. to House Bill 1901. Senate Amendment #1 merely puts into the Bill the pay-back procedure that already exists in the family practice program which was instituted in the last Session of the General Assembly. Senate Amendment #2 revises the title as it did in 19.. House Bill 1902 when we.. which we acted on yesterday. And it deletes the word, 'tuition', and makes it 'a grant program.' I would move that we would concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to House Bill 1901."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1901. If there's no discussion, those in favor... No. Representative Barnes?"

Barnes: "One and two."

Speaker Matijevich: "One and three, I'm sorry. One and three..."

Barnes: "One and two."

Speaker Matijevich: "One and two, we've got it right this time.

Those infavor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 156 'aye', no 'nay', one answering 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1901. House Bill 2376, Betty Lou Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2376 authorizes the Department of Transportation



to be the coordinating agency to accept any federal monies in relation to water related problems. Senate Amendment #1 provides authority to the Division of Water Resources of the Department of Transportation to grant easements or permits across public land for any kind of activity to do with construction operation maintaining ditches, that sort of thing, for the public good. Senate Amendment as far as I can tell is simply providing the statutory language for what is currently the responsibility of the Division of Water Resources. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reed moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2376. On that, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Pullen: "Would Senate Amendment #1 have any effect on the final authority of the Legislature to enact Bills concerning easements? Would this remove the authority from the Legislature to grant easements?"

Reed: "Not to my knowledge, Penny. This is only across state owned property as far as I know."

Pullen: "Well, I think that the easements that we're granting in statutes now are having to do with state owned property aren't they?"

Reed: "Well, I suppose yes, some of them are. This has to do with anything that's related to water resource management; storm sewers, ditches, drainage ditches, streams. I think it's simply a statutory means of giving the Division of Water Resources the actual authority to do what they're doing right now in relation to any of those projects taking place on state owned land."

Pullen: "I just want to be sure that in giving them that authority, we aren't taking it away from ourselves. I



have no further questions."

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

Getty: "Would the Lady yield?"

Reed: "Yes, Sir."

Getty: "I don't have any question about the authority to grant the easement, but would this not require also that there be compensation at the appraised value?"

Reed: "Representative Getty, I don't happen to have the Senate Amendment in front of me. And I can't tell you. I've only looked in my Digest and my analysis."

Getty: "Well, I do have it in front of me. It is very broad. It permits the Department to grant to any municipal utility, transportation company, corporation..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Why don't we take this out, Betty, and you and Mike Getty get together and see if there's a problem? If so, you can nonconcur. Alright?"

Reed: "Fine, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Okay. The.. House Bill 1970, Representative Peters, the Gentleman from Cook. House Bill 1970, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1970, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1970. When Senate.. When House Bill 1970 left the House, what it provided for was to give the counties an option to increase their Boards of Health. That was done in order to bring into compliance our statutes with federal statutes which require a 12 Member Board of Health for counties to be the recipient of added federal funds for various kinds of projects. What the Senate did in Amendment #1 was to add a Bill having to do with the inspection of downstate restaurants and other facilities. That Amendment was discussed somewhat yesterday. If anyone has any further questions on it, Representative Kempiners



is much more aware of the ins and outs of that Amendment and I would defer any questions to him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Peters moves that we . . . I'll get to you . . . that the House. . . Well, you want to get to it now? Oh. . . That the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1970. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my recollection, I believe last night, that one of the Members raised a question of germaneness. I don't believe that was ruled on. It was taken out of the record for the purpose of that and I think that Member who raised it is off the floor.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Is Representative Stuffle here? I don't see him here. Alright, we'll get to the Order of Nonconcurrency. Senate Bill 1037, Woods Bowman is not in his seat right now. Bill Laurino is not in his seat. Kucharski? Is Kucharski over there? On Senate Bill 1237, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "1238, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "1238, I'm sorry. 1238."

Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, Representative Kucharski moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1238. 1238, those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and the House does refuse to recede from Senate (sic) Amendment #1 to House (sic) Bill 1238. And request for a Conference Committee. 1277, Ropp, on page five. Oh, just one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, for what purpose do you arise?"

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to remind the Members that



are going to go home tomorrow, that a lot of the gas stations in Springfield are going to close today at 2:00 o'clock. I filled up my tank already. A lot of them are going to close at 2:00 o'clock and a lot of them aren't going to be open tomorrow. So if you haven't got gas, it might be a good idea to go out and get some gas now before they close."

Speaker Matijevich: "I filled up, too, Roger. I just hope we're going home. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative... Oh, Pullen is on 1277. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen on 1277, Senate Bill 1277, page five."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Bill that would have the school children in Illinois say the pledge of allegiance in school and in the House we adopted an Amendment that included having them... well, it went through several Amendment stages but the upshot of it was that they would also be saying the pledge of allegiance at sporting events at elementary school and the Senate didn't agree with us on that and I would move to recede from our Amendments and that would leave the Bill in the posture that the pledge of allegiance would be recited by pupils in elementary school in Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, Representative Pullen moves that the House recede from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1277. On that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tell me what does that leave us with? I'm... "

Pullen: "That leaves us with the pledge being said by the pupils in elementary school every day, no sporting events."

Schneider: "So it takes out.. It leaves K to 12?"

Pullen: "No, it's not K to 12. It would be effectively K to



8. It's the way that it came from the Senate."

Schneider: "K through 8 with the pledge everyday in the classroom and at sporting events for kids from K to 8?"

Pullen: "No, no sporting events."

Schneider: "Not at all."

Pullen: "Just in the classroom."

Schneider: "Classroom pledge of allegiance."

Pullen: "Right."

Schneider: "And it's a mandatory provision....."

Pullen: "Yes, it's a no cost mandate."

Schneider: "A no cost mandate. It's a bargain. Mr. Speaker, on the Bill itself again, I don't think there's any doubt in my mind about the serious questions of Constitutionality when you're mandating individuals to say the pledge of allegiance. I think we ought to give that consideration. I know that Representative Katz in his comments earlier in the debate and Representative Mugalian, also argued that point. I would suggest to you again what I was stating the other day is that I don't know how the pledge of allegiance can be effective in terms of developing citizenship. The total educational program that most and all school districts probably offer on understanding citizenship, the role of the individual in a democratic society, that is taught day in and day out. Children socialize in America. I don't believe fail to develop a respect for their country. They respect and understand the symbolism of the flag. They understand hopefully by the time they leave eighth grade the significance of the conflict that lend to the development of our society, that is the political society of the American Revolution. They know the significance then of the those.. those people who sacrificed for the kind of society that we are trying to defend today. I think we can argue effectively in this chamber as we have done constantly that American



children love and respect their country because of the give and take, not for regimentation of memorizing the pledge of allegiance, but for the flexibility to look at what the Constitution is. No one doubts the value of our society. No one will ever fail to understand the value of our society in a total educational program that I think American kids are offered and certainly in Illinois. I've been a teacher since 1962. I don't... And as I see the children at the end of the 12 year cycle for elementary and high school, it amazes me that the children are open, responsible, respectful of the American citizenship role that they will play as they leave the classroom at the age of 17 or 18. This is a ludicrous proposal. It takes time for people to realize the value of our society. Memorizing and saying every day the pledge of allegiance becomes irrelevant. It's like going to the baseball game and singing the Star Bangled Banner and expecting the bleacher bums not to throw beer on the baseball players because they love to play. I would ask that we defeat the proposal, that the schools be allowed to control their own kinds of programs as it relates to citizenship. This may be a noncost mandate, but it becomes an irrelevance to children whether they are in kindergarden or in 12th grade. I ask a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the previous spokesman eloquently made a case in regard to this motion. I recognize that as we looked at this Bill in the Education Committee another factor and that was that if you attempt to do this in the Junior High School where you have students moving from room to room and not in one room, and many of them do not have home rooms, you



create a significant logistical problem. I didn't feel that way about the logistics of it when it was on a basis of K through 6 and on the basis of that, the Sponsor amended the Bill to make it apply to cases through 6 where you have self contained classrooms. This factor is another reason why this particular motion to recede should not be adopted and for that reason I would oppose the motion."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think most people in this House have objected to additional mandates on a public school. And that's a position I think we sincerely hold even if it doesn't require additional expenditures by our public schools. There's a good reason for that. Because each school district is unique. Each district in all different parts of the state have different population groups, different ethnic groups and so forth. There's a very compelling reason to vote against this Bill. And that is because the United States Supreme Court has declared that children do not have to say the pledge. The basis of that.. that decision involved a Jehovah's witnesses. But that same claim can be made by any other religious groups, or in fact, by those who belong to no religious group. What this will mean is that in every school district in the state, by mandating a pledge by the Legislature, we will have different children and different groups in different school districts refusing to take the pledge. And they may refuse to take the pledge under the Constitution of the United States as explained in the Supreme Court decision to which I refer. There are reasons for local options. There are reasons why we shouldn't make mandates. In addition, this is not a mandate that improves the quality of education. In that sense it's



an irrelevant mandate. We are trying to impose some kind of patriotism in a way that is counterproductive. As has been pointed out, one does not make patriots by making them salute anything or by making them observe any kind of ritual. Real and true patriotism comes from the heart and from an understanding of what free men and women may be allowed to do in a free republic. This action is not a republican kind of action. It is undemocratic. It denies the individual worth and individual right to free action by our citizens. And worst of all, it is imposed upon school children who if they exercise their Constitutional rights not to say the pledge, will be subjected to severe peer pressures. We are injuring... we will be injuring thousands and thousands of young impressionable children because we are directing school districts to require them to take this act. But if they follow their consciences and state they cannot say the pledge, they will be set aside and they will be.. they will suffer humiliation. That is not the kind of mandate that this Legislature should impose. I urge you to do away with this nonsense and kill this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: " Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please, merely to qualify something for me and hopefully for other Members of the House. My understanding is that what we're doing is mandating the schools to provide the opportunity for children to learn the pledge of allegiance and to say it. We are not mandating each child to say the pledge of allegiance. Is that true, Representative Pullen?"

Pullen: "The Bill says that the pledge of allegiance shall be recited by pupils in elementary school. It does not



say.. It does not use the word 'all' and there are no penalties included in the Bill."

Hallstrom: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski... Kosinski I mean."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kosinski moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and the main question is put. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, to close."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, when this Bill passed the House the other day it had over 120 good votes on it. And I'd appreciate the support of the House at that time and I will appreciate the support of the House today. I think we debated it so fully then that I don't want to take the time of this House to repeat everything that I said at that time, but I ask you to keep in mind the effects that the pledge of allegiance has had on this House which I think has been beneficial. I don't think that it has hurt anyone in this chamber. I think that it is a shame that our children are not learning the pledge of allegiance in school today and the reason for this Bill is so that they will learn the pledge and learn it well enough that they will remember it for life. So that when they become Members of this Assembly they won't be embarrassed when the Speaker calls on them to lead the pledge. And so that they will consider this part of citizenship activity. I think it will provide good decorum in the classroom and it will provide a good opening to the school day. We all said it when we were in school. I ask you to join me in asking the school children of Illinois to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America. Please vote 'aye'."



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen moves that the House do recede from Senate Amendment... House Amendments 1,2 and 3 to Senate Bill.. Senate Bill 1277. The.. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Representative Willer, one minute to explain her vote."

Willer: "This Bill does not say 'may', it says 'shall'. It doesn't say, 'shall provide an opportunity', it says, 'shall be recited'. That is a mandate. There's no penalty the Sponsor says. Well it seems to me if you pass a law and then say we don't care if you don't abide by it, there's no penalty, you're making a mockery of the law. This should be a Resolution then if we want the schools this tradition of having the children recite the pledge. You either have a law that means something or you don't. Now if it has no penalty, then we're making a mockery of the rule.. the law making process. I think the schools are going to be sort of puzzled by it if they hear the Sponsor say, well there's no penalty. Do as you wish."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, one minute to explain his vote."

Johnson: "Well, there's just one point. You know we don't need to discuss the issue anymore, but I think there's one point, particularly those of you who have a lot of private schools in your area ought to look at. The effect of receding from House Amendment #3 is to delete the provisions limiting this to public schools. The effect of that would be that schools whether they be Catholic schools or more appropriately ones that, let's say, Amish schools like we have in our area and Jehovah witnesses and others who set up churches.. church schools without public funds who don't want to say the pledge of allegiance, not because they're anti-American, because it's against the tenants of their



religion are being forced by receding from Amendment #3 to say the pledge and we're forcing something on a religious minority that's really unfair. Now I don't want to speak again to the general issue, but those of you who are concerned about freedom of religion and not imposing state mandates on private schools, that's exactly what we're doing when we're receding from..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff, one minute to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be very succinct. Just remind you that patriotism, like loyalty that we're discussing here, has to be taught. I'm sorry. I was going to say that prejudices like loyalty has to be taught."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, the Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson, one minute to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was a little surprised at the Sponsor because House Amendment #1 I helped with that and that's really the only way she gets this Bill out of Committee was by you know, having it from grades one through six. And now she's receding from this Amendment. And I really don't ... I resent this, that I helped her get the Bill out of Committee by House Amendment 1 and now she's receding from this. It puts the Bill back in its original shape that would never get out of Committee in the first place. And I urge you to change your vote to 'no' and that we divide the question and send it back to the Senate."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, one minute to explain his vote."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a confession to everybody that it wasn't till I was 12 years or 13 years old that I thought it wasn't invisible. I thought it was invisible. You know, one nation, indivisible. And I think that's what happens to most people who just



say things. A lot of times the language just doesn't mean anything. And I was 14, or maybe even older, till I knew what the words were and the meaning of those words. And I'm not sure we do anything with it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, I just wanted to comment to Representative Greiman that he went to O'Keefe School. He should have come south to 71st street and we could have taught him the pledge."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, one minute to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I said the pledge of allegiance throughout my entire school years because the parochial school I went to insist that I say prayers daily. And I thought when I got elected to the General Assembly, everybody had been through the same good Americanism good ideals that I've been through, but I find that in city councils, county Boards, and in the Congress and in the House there are more bigoted people here, more narrow minded, prejudice people here that would deprive you of your liberty if they had the chance, that I think you ought to be.. I think the newspaper, radios and television stations ought to be singing out the pledge of allegiance daily because it doesn't affect many of them anyway."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'aye', 36 'nay', and the House refuses' recesses from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1277. Senate Bill 1342, Peters. I don't see him on the.. Oh. Peters is on the floor. Senate Bill 1342. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to recede from Senate Amendment... er.. House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1342. The Department of Children and Family Services has removed its objection. This is a Bill that was initiated by some meetings with the juvenile court people in Chicago, with Judge White and Judge McCury. We passed it here, out of the Senate, added an Amendment. The Senate had some problems with it and the Department of Children and Family Services had some problems . We added an Amendment. The Bill now comes back and DCFS has removed its .. as removed it s objection and what the Amendment did was insert the word 'judicial' before the word 'supervision'. They wanted some clarification as to what supervision means and they are now finding that it's getting into more problems than what they had before so I would just move to recede from the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Peters moves to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1342. The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, are you on this, the discussion? No? Your light was on. If there's no discussion, the question is... All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'aye', no 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. And the House recedes from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1342. And this Bill is declared passed. Just to make sure, we'll say that in Senate Bill 1277 also the Bill is declared passed. Senate Bill 1386, the Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386. 1386 amended the Fair Employment Practices Act. It authorizes orders for



reinstatement, hiring, back pay costs, and attorneys' fees for plaintiffs in proceedings under the Act. It also authorizes award of defendants' attorneys fees when the complaint is frivolous and is persisted in after it becomes so. I'd like to explain to the Members of the House that I appreciate very much the Amendments that were put on in the House by two Members on the other side of the aisle in the Judicial Committee. I know that is why we did get it out of the House. I also know that it is a very fair Bill even without these Amendments. In the wisdom of the Senate, they have asked now that those Amendments be taken off. I would ask that we concur with this because I believe that such a fair Bill if it goes to Conference Committee I'm afraid that something may happen to it that'll make it less than fair. I would urge the Members of the House to please vote to recede on Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom, has moved that the House recede from Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Those in favor signi...' Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Hallstrom: "Certainly."

Greiman: "Amendment #3 which was offered in Committee deals with the two year back .. the ability to go more than two years back. Is that right, Ms. Hallstrom?"

Hallstrom: "Yes. Yew, I believe that is right, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, is it your position that this Bill without the two year limitation will allow people who had their cases dismissed a couple of years ago because of



jurisdictional problems, and statute limitation problems that they will not be affected by this?"

Hallstrom : "They will not be affected and that is an opinion from the General Council of the Fair Employment Practices Commission. I have been absolutely assured that what you're seeking is there."

Greiman: "Well, okay. I would . . . I would make this statement then. This General Assembly has enacted a Fair Employment Practices Act. We found that more than 3,000 people who had applied for . . . or 2,000 people who had applied for claims under the FEPC had their claims dismissed about two years ago as a result of a Supreme Court case. It said that the Commission had to act within a particular time limitation and that the Commission not having acted, all of those cases were dismissed. Subsequent to that and during the last year of the last Session we passed remedial legislation that revived those cases. I'm told that I guess most of them have refiled. Is that correct? Alright, most of them have refiled. So that we now have 2,000 and some cases that have been refiled. I think it would be a terrible, terrible, terrible thing for us to find that somehow we have allowed the statutes to come in that would affect those 2,000 cases. I don't know how we would explain to people that they were once dismissed because of the Commission's failure to move appropriately and now they were dismissed because the General Assem... some language in a Bill that was put in unintentionally. I think we have probably made a record and you are telling me and you are telling for the record that it is not your intention and it is not the intention of any part of the legislation that these cases. . . that this provision affects those 2500 cases that are now pending. Is that right?"

Hallstrom: "That's absolutely right and I'd like to quote from



letter, Sir, that was written to you from the Attorney General... er... the General Council of the the Fair Employment Practices Commission. I agree with you completely and I feel confident when he says, 'your concern I understand is to be assured that this provision would not adversely affect complainants with back lot charges.' The Bill will not have such an effect."

Greiman: "Let's hope we're both right."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman, Representative Hallock, moves the previous question. Well, we only have one more, Representative Brummer. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I apologize. I was off the floor, but are you moving to recede from the Amendment changing the 'or' to 'and' with regard to the right of the Commission to award attorneys' fees against the complainant, against the employee who feels that he is discriminated against to the employer?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Yes, Representative Brummer, as you know, in the discussion in the Judicial Committee and I guess since you were off the floor you did not hear me say that I appreciated your help in getting that Bill out of Committee. It went back of course to the Senate. They were concerned about that Amendment. I offered to recede it because I think it's a fair Bill on both sides for the employer and the employee and I'm afraid that it will get lost if it goes back to the Conference Committee. Since then, Sir, I also have found out that this ruling is the same as the Supreme Court's



ruling on the Civil Rights Act, that there has been no problem with this particular Section."

Brummer: "May I address the motion..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Brummer: "The motion to recede briefly. This matter was heard twice in the Judiciary Committee. The first time it did not pass. The second time it did not pass. The Amendment that went on here was discussed and was rejected by the Sponsor. They did not want to proceed with it. Then after a loss a second time and I suppose was technically dead, the Sponsor talked to me or those interested in the Bill and said ask me if I would move to reconsider. We would put the Amendment on and vote the Bill out of the Committee. Now let's look at the so.. First of all this Bill would never have been alive, never been out of here unless we had ... never been alive out of Committee unless we had put that Amendment on. Let's look at the substance of that. What this allows is the.. the Commission to order attorney fees against the employee, against the working stiff, so to speak, as a result of filing a complaint with regard to certain standards. Now, this is the individual who is not wealthy, cannot afford an attorney in the first place in many instances, is talking about an unempl.. unfair employment practice. We do not have a general concept in the law of awarding attorney fees against the losing party. That is a new concept. That is a very questionable concept in the first place, I think. And then to set up the standard that this Bill does unamended of frivolous, unreasonable or groundless. Now I'm not an FEPC expert, but I know that in civil litigations if a complaint is dismissed for failure to state a course of action which is frequently done, I would have some concern that the Commission may find that this is groundless and this would have a very chilling



effect on those individuals who want to file FEPC claims that may have been discriminated against, may have legitimate claims, but suddenly because of the spector of attorneys' fees be awarding against them as a result of them filing a claim and that the concern that somehow the Commission may find this frivolous or may find it unreasonable or may find it groundless, may finding it not stating a proper cause of action, that they would have attorneys' fees entered against them in favor of the large employer and against the small employee, I think that is a bad concept and therefore, I would urge everyone here to vote 'no' on these motions to recede."

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

Bullock: "Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a substitute motion.."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I had made a move to the previous question. If we're going to allow Members to go on debating after that motion is made we should take a vote on that motion right now."

Speaker Matijevich: "Okay.. I left. There was only one light on after you made it and I think he is in order now to .. to move the previous question because that was the intention prior. Representative Hallock moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor .. I'll get... You can explain your vote, but he had moved it prior. There was only one light. Since there was only one light, I... Alright. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. And the 'aye's have it. The Lady from Cook, Representative



Hallstrom to close."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to explain that I would have the same..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Hallstrom. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Brummer: "Yes, I would like to make a substitute motion that we not recede. I think that is in order at any time."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, why don't we go with this and then let's just see what happens here."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, I think the substitute motion is in order at any time."

Hallstrom: "Mr. Speaker, do I have a right..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment please. The Parliamentarian tells me she objects and you not being the Sponsor it's not in order. So let's continue with the motion to recede. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I'm not sure if I understood the ruling of the Chair correctly. Are you saying that any time the Sponsor of the motion objects to a substitute motion that the original Sponsor of the motion has a right to object and therefore a substitute motion is not in order?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Bill is not in Conference Committee. It is still in control of the Sponsor. If the Sponsor objects then it is not in order."

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, you sat here last night and made that substitute motion yourself two or three times and we voted on it on a motion not to recede. You made a substitute motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Nobody objected at that time. Alright. Representative Hallstrom, we're back to you."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House. I would like the Representative to know I am not anxious to get in any battle over this. I think we both want the same thing. There's no way that I want an employee who may not be in the same, certainly in the same financial condition as a large employer, I don't want him to be in a lot of trouble. But I have been assured by the FEPC that this is the same as the Supreme Court ruling Title 7, the Civil Rights Act and they have not found this chilling effect. So I think we're looking for something that's not going to happen. And in the interests of fairness on both sides, I feel this is a really good piece of legislation and I would urge you to support it. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom, moves that the House do recede from Amend... House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed 'no'. This is final action. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, to explain his vote."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree entirely with the two previous speakers on this side of the aisle, Representative Greiman and Representative Brummer. I think that the net effect of us backing down on this excellent House Amendment will be to put this Bill in the posture that it is duplicative. Existing legislation has been passed on this subject. And we have proposed by the Governor a new Civil Rights Agency and I certainly would join with them. If it gets 89 votes we'll ask for verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are ... Representative Barnes? Change Barnes from 'no' to 'aye'. On this question there are 89 'aye', ... Well let's ... We're going to take another Roll Call. We're dumping this Roll Call."



Take...The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Hit your own switches. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 'aye', 65 'no'. And the Lady... I'm.. Huskey, I'm getting to her. And the Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have a poll of the absentees please?"

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady requests a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will call the absentees."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, for what purpose do you arise?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, for inquiry of the Chair. I have a UPI story here that says that Bill Mahar an inmate at the Marion Senate Peni.. Penitentiary dies Thursday of a heart attack. I see Mahar is voting on this Bill. Could you tell him?"

Speaker Matijeich: "He was only wounded in that skirmish that Commander Griesheimer led into Wisconsin. But they thought it was more serious than it was. He's alright."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "Continue with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Breslin. Capparelli. Darrow. Dawson. Deuster. Donovan. Ewell. Hannig. Harris. Emil Jones. Katz. Keane. Kelly..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Katz 'aye'. Katz 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Klosak. Marovitz. Molloy. Richmond. Schisler. Sharp. Stuffle. Terzich. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeich: "On this.. On this question there are 87 'aye' and 60... one moment. The Lady from Cook, Repre-



sentative Hallstrom, for what purpose do you arise?

Representative Hallstrom, for what purpose..."

Hallstrom: "Yes, please. Would you call again on Representative Klosak? I do not believe his vote was recorded."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Klosak, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Record him as 'aye'. Who else? Representative Telcser 'aye'.. from 'no' to 'aye'. Wyvetter Younger 'aye'. Big 'Al', Ronan 'no'. Ronan 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, for what purpose do you arise?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, the two Gentleman on this side of the aisle that are the Sponsors of these Amendments in Committee have asked me to withdraw the motion and in consideration of the liberation of this House and the pressing business that we have to finish on the last day, I certainly would not want to interrupt the continuity and I would, regardless of what number of votes that are up there, withdraw the motion for verification....."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. Representative Sandquist, from 'no' to 'aye'. Have all voted? I guess we have. No, I hope it's favorable. 90 'aye', 64 'nay', and the Senate does... er.. the House does move to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to... The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I don't want to withdraw a verification and I'd like a verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I didn't hear you, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I want to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. There is a request for a verification. The... There are... 90 'aye' and 60 what? 64 'no'. And the House does recede from Amend-



ments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386 and there's a request for a verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wolf: "Might I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Jacob J. Wolf as an 'aye' vote. The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge, for what purpose do you arise?"

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, I change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Wyvetter Younge from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Balanoff. Record Balanoff as 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Cullerton 'no'... from 'aye' to 'no'. Greiman. Representative Alan Greiman from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Stuffle 'no'. Representative Sam Wolf from 'aye' to 'no'. We'll get them all. He's trying to catch up. Alright. Hannig, Gary Hannig 'no'. Doug Kane you're on 'no'. Jack Williams from 'aye' to 'no'. We'll get to you. Alright, the Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hallstrom: "Mr. Speaker, I also do not want to take the time of the House. I'm understanding what's happening and I would move then to put this in Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, Representative Hallstrom moves that the House refuse to recede on House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386 and that a Conference Committee be appointed. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1386 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. We haven't announced the results of the motion to recede. And that was 84 'aye', 73 'no' and that motion fails. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, on Senate Bill 490."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House,



I move to recede on House Amendment 2 and House Amendment 3 on Senate Bill 490. House Amendment 2 dealt with an additional \$500,000 to be added to the Illinois Arts Council budget and House Amendment 3 added \$200,000 to the Illinois Arts Council budget and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes moves to recede from Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 490. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would offer a substitute motion that the House do not recede from Senate... from House Amendment 3. I assume there may be one for 2 as well. I don't which ruling...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The House... The Parliamentarian has already ruled for me that that's out of order as long as the Sponsor objects..."

Greiman: "Well, then I'd like to speak on the motion..."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll go with hers. You want to proceed and debate against her motion?"

Greiman: "Please if I may."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "We put House Amendment 3 which deals with the development of a very large cultural center for Polish culture in the north side of the city of Chicago on by a very large margin in this House. The Amendment carried 3 to 2 in this House. It went to concurrence in the Senate and it missed on a verified Roll Call by one vote. It got 29 affirmative votes and some people were knocked off to bring it down to that 29. So that it's very.. It's a very close question even with the Senate. It may be that there's a question of amount that's involved and that we can work out the amount of money involved in a Conference Committee. I know that there may be something between the House and Senate Sponsor in this case, but I think if it



goes to Conference Committee, we can adjust the amount and all we ask then is that there be a Conference Committee appointed to adjust the amount involved and I would ask that the House vote 'no' on the Lady from Cook's motion to recede."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates she will."

Totten: "Amendment #2 was the one we put on in the House for how much money?"

Barnes: "Hi, John. Thank you. Amendment #2 was for the \$500,000 which would have been distributed to the entire State of Illinois which I was very much in favor of."

Totten: "Okay. What was Amendment 3?"

Barnes: "Amendment 3 was an Amendment that there is to begin with, I would like everybody to know there's nothing between the Senate Sponsor and myself. Representative Greiman came and asked me if he could put this Amendment on for purely political and getting out a press release purposes and I would never deny any Legislator that opportunity. However, this \$200,000 is in the wrong budget. It belongs in the Department of Natural Resources which funds public land museums which the Gateway Polish Museum is and not in the Illinois Arts Council budget and that's why I'm against Amendment 3."

Totten: "Okay. Now, what is the total bottom line on the dollars for the Arts Council?"

Barnes: "It is 2 million 944 thousand and 800 dollars."

Totten: "How much is that over last year's budget?"

Barnes: "Let me see. Just one moment. It is 100.... 154.9 thousand."

Totten: "154 thousand or 154 thousand over?"



Barnes: "Yeah.."

Totten: "Last year? Okay. How much of an increase is that since the Arts Council was started? Do you know?"

Barnes: "Well, Representative Totten, I don't really think that's the issue."

Totten: "Okay. I'll make it one of the issues when I speak to the Bill if I can."

Barnes: "Alright."

Totten: "Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, or fortunately, the Sponsor has a good motion. The motion is to recede from the two pork Amendments that we put on in the House Committee on this Bill. I think the Amendments total 700 thousand dollars reduction if we go with her motion. I think we should go... We should support the Lady from Cook with her motion because if this thing ever goes to a Conference Committee, the sky is the limit on this Arts Council. This particular pork agency started about ten years ago with a \$25,000 or \$35,000 appropriation. 13 years ago, Representative Collins reminds me. \$25,000. Now we came out of this House with a budget of almost 3 million dollars. Every little art group in the state has got their fingers in the pie. In fact, some groups are created just to get their fingers in the pie for this Arts Council. Members of the House have been... have been subjected to lobbying like you wouldn't believe to get their support. I can remember in my own district a number of years ago when I got a report from the Arts Council that they were going to.. that they had granted a \$500 grant for a wheel turning exposition in one of the high schools. I didn't know what wheel turning was. So I called the high school and asked them what it was and they told me it had something to do with ceramics. Well, the neighboring district to mind, there's one of the biggest pottery manufacturerers in the



country called 'Hager' and I asked them if they did these types of demonstrations around the area and they told me, yes, they do them in high schools for nothing. But the Arts Council also found some wheel turner and decided to give him \$500 to go around to these different high schools. He got \$500 for one exhibition at a high school in my district. It could have been done for nothing. But why should the public body get somebody to do it for nothing who probably has more experience because he does it professionally when they can get some artist either from under Lower Wacker Drive or where the other places the Arts Council has left its scars and bring them around the country and pay them and some of these people are doing it and more and more are doing it because now we're up to 3 million dollars. We can't beat the budget. We can't reduce the budget. The motion to recede is a good one. Maybe next year we can get at it and eliminate this.. this cancer on our taxpayers' pocketbooks. So I would concur with the Lady that we ought to remove the \$700,000 that are on here. Next year is another year for the Arts Council and I would ask for a favorable vote on her motion to recede from Amendments 2 and 3."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and the previous... main question is put. The Lady from Cook, Representative Jane Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank Representative Totten for being so supportive in my motion to recede. I would also like all of the Body to



know that while I was born and raised on the south side in Visitation Parish I went to high school in Jefferson Park where the Gateway Theatre is and my husband and I used to court in the theatre occasionally so I am very familiar with the Gateway Museum and being a Polish neighborhood I am very sympathetic toward the cause of this museum and that's where I affectionately learned to use a few clichés such as (Polish phrases) so I am really in sympathy with the Polish people, but I would like to reiterate that this money does not belong in the Illinois Arts Council budget. We would be starting a very, very serious precedent. It belongs in the Department of Natural Resources and it's for that reason I do not want this to go to a Conference Committee. Everybody knows how hard I've fought for the \$500,000 which I thought was distributive and fair throughout the State of Illinois. It was a very difficult decision for me to give up the fight for the \$500,000 but rather than start a bad precedent, I urge everybody to please vote 'yes' with me and we'll take this up at another time next year. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes moves that the House do recede from House Amendments 2 and 3 on Senate Bill 490. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Phil Collins, to explain his vote."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand before you a man that is crushed. I take this as a personal affront. Now I think that everyone in this House knows my reputation as a patron of the arts. Everyone here is well aware of my support of this agency from its inception. This is the Illinois Arts Council. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that Amendment #1 puts



\$500,000 into this budget? This is \$500,000 that could have been used to put more poetry on the buses. Why, my Lord, we could put it in taxicabs. We could put it limosines where people can read on the way to the cemetery. This is money that could have allowed more Japanese artists to paint Michigan Avenue both up and down above and below in Chicago. This is money that could have been planted. It would have been seed money in the Victory Garden Theatre. This is money that could have been used to establish the Carol Braun School of Dance. And you're going to deprive the people of Illinois this \$500,000 and, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3. This was for the Polish Museum. And I talked to you. You people of Polish, Irish, what have you descent, we have a Polish Pope. This Amendment is... This motion is not only unAmerican, it's anti-Catholic. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, defeat, defeat this bad motion. I stand before you as one who has spoken on behalf of the arts for 13 long years and I say for the first time you're voting right. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Just a question, Mr. Speaker. Was that a live program or was that a pre-recorded program?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also am a patron of the arts along with Representative Collins and I've arranged a tour of all the catacombs of Chicago and all the viaducts underneath Michigan Avenue and some of the viaducts in the.. along the market area where these artists have been hired and commissioned to paint these beautiful paintings of scorpions and snakes and gila monsters and everything else is something that you really have to see. This Illinois Arts Council is really doing a wonderful job of decorating



the neighborhoods in Chicago, the catacombs and the underground viaducts with all kinds of wildlife. It's something you have to see and I've arranged a bus tour for any Legislators who want to come up to Chicago, get ahold of me the first Sunday in August and I'll take you around and show you all this beautiful work. And on the bus we'll have all these wonderful poems that they always write and plaster all over the RTA and the CTA buses in Chicago. It is something you have got to behold and you've never seen anything like it before in your life or after."

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

Barnes: "A poll of the absentees please."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has requested a poll of the absentees. Soon as the machine puts out the sheet of paper we will start the poll of the absentees.

Representative Wikoff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I hit the wrong button. Vote me 'yes' please."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Wikoff to 'yes'. Representative..

Representative Grossi to 'yes'. When it comes out we'll change those too. Representative Neff. Change Neff to ... from 'no' to 'aye'. Friedrich? Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that it caught us off guard if we had Jake Wolf here with his.. he could have read some of those things we put on the CTA. I don't think we'd have any problem and you really ought to give us a chance to read some more of those to you to find out what you're money's going for."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, maybe we don't have a problem. They are changing votes. Representative Anderson, you .. change you from 'no' to 'aye'. Anderson 'no' to 'aye'.



Representative Tuerk, he wants to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Fred Tuerk. Representative Pechous from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Virginia Frederick."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'aye'?"

Speaker Flinn: "Record Virginia Frederick as 'aye' and Deuster as 'aye'. Jack... Well, I've got to go a little slower. Yes. Just a minute. I'm trying to catch up. Let the Clerk keep us with us. Representative Jack Davis as 'aye'. Representative Jim Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, record me 'aye' please."

Speaker Flinn: "Record Taylor as 'aye'. Emil Jones... Let's... If everybody's here, all the hands are up. Let's take a new Roll Call. Dump that Roll Call. All of those in favor of receding from Amendments #1.. rather 2 and 3 on Senate Bill 490 will vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Punch those buttons now. I'm not going to be recognizing everybody all over again. There were 20 people standing up trying to get their names changed... vote changed rather. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'aye', and 52 'nay' and the House does recede from Amendments #2 and 3 to Senate Bill 490. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 362, Representative Stuffle is recognized for a motion."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I would move at this' time to recede from the two House Amendments the Senate failed to concur in on Senate Bill 362. The two Amendments are those that were hotly contested and heatedly debated here on the floor regarding defining the financing terms in the downstate police and fire systems. As you know we passed Senate Bill 1360 out of both chambers and sent it to the Governor which provided for a 40 year amortization of the unfunded liabilities in the



downstate police and fire pension systems. The two Amendments that were offered by Representative Terzich and I and he is in agreement with this motion, provided for spelling out what that financing would be in terms of what the rates would be and what the Department of Insurance's powers would be in giving standing to local people to sue. In light of the Senate's action and the position of the municipal league I'm asking you today to recede from these Amendments. I've talked with the municipal league, talked with municipal officials. They say they can't live with these. I believe that we can keep the teeth in the law without them. I was merely trying to strengthen this program as was Representative Terzich. So at this time so as not to jeopardize the rest of the Bill which was agreed on basically Amendments approved by the Pension Laws Commission, I would move that we recede from the two House Amendments to Senate Bill 362."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House recede from Amendments #10 and 13 on Senate Bill 362. All those in favor of that motion vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'aye', one 'nay', and the House does recede from Amendments #10 and 13 to Senate Bill 362 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Flinn: "Senate Bill 1377. Representative Reilly is recognized for a motion."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When we passed House Bill 1377 out of here it contained Amendment #19. What Amendment #19 did, and it was put on by Representative Catania, Amendment #19 repealed a provision of the state law which we passed unanimously or virtually unanimously out of the House 2 years ago and which passed the Senate unanimously. That provision of the law says that compliance by credit card companies on those little forms you get, the little forms with the microscopic type, that compliance with Federal Law as to those disclosures is the same as compliance with State Law. The purpose of this is to make sure that the credit card companies didn't have to send out two different forms. A Bill to do this in the Senate got 11 votes on a motion to discharge. When the motion was made to concur in Amendment #19 in the Senate the Senate rejected that by a vote of 6 to 45 to 3. Personally, I don't care very strongly one way or the other about the Amendment but it's crystal clear that the Amendment is not acceptable to the Senate. This is the last day of this Session and so I am forced to ask that the House recede from the Amendment. I would hate to jeopardize this Bill just because of this one Amendment and so I do make the motion to recede. This will be final action and the last time you have to hear this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House recede from Amendment #19 from Senate Bill 1377. And on that motion, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So the Membership knows

what we've voting on, this is final action of the Illinois Human Rights Act. This is a major legislative proposal, which was debated at great length about a few days ago at which I spoke at some length myself. It's a rare opportunity that we do have a chance to right what I think was an error in our legislative program. I think it would be a good idea to reject this motion to recede and put this Bill into a Conference Committee and clean up its many deficiencies. Now I went through a large number of them the other night, that I thought were deficiencies and which apparently the Sponsor did not agree because there have been no corrective actions. A number of others pointed out what they considered to be deficiencies also, which were not the result of corrective actions. I was not really aware that this Bill would be called at this precise moment, which isn't of course the Sponsor's fault, it's my own fault. I don't have all of my notes before me that I had a few nights ago when I did speak on the Bill after having read it. I would suggest that, to many of you who have not read the Bill, and I would imagine that's most of you, that there are many provisions in here which are going to make profound changes in our way of life as a result of some of the substantive changes in our Civil Rights Acts. Again, I have no objection to the consolidation aspects of the Illinois Human Rights Act. I think that, in general, consolidations are good. The substantive provisions on this aspect I don't think will do...certainly do any harm and probably will do some good and probably will save the state taxpayers some money. However, the substantive provisions changing materially some of the Civil



Rights Acts in this state, I think will have profound effects. I mentioned many of them the night...the other night. One of which, by opening up public accommodations to people, regardless of status of marriage, and again I would point out to the Sponsor who belittled the point and claimed that I was trying to raise a bugaboo, that status of marriage will indeed include the provisions allowing gay rights to attack any attempt to prevent them from enjoying public accommodations on the grounds of homosexuality. This is not an idle threat, I am not trying to torpedo the Bill by raising that particular spector. However, I do want to point out that this particular group of people have become very litigious in nature and they're going to grasp at these provisions which are material, substantial changes, in attempting to bring about their way. I think that this provision, this motion should be defeated, that we should send this Bill into Conference Committee. And many of the provisions...another one that came to light the other night, to my mind, was the provision which will make it a violation of civil rights of a person who is not handicapped to prevent him from using a handicapped parking place. This is absolutely ridiculous. The provision shouldn't be in there. It should be cleaned up before it goes to the Governor. So I would ask you, Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, to reject this motion to recede and instead send this to a Conference Committee and hope that the final product will be clean and one that we can all support in light with the idea of consolidation and restatement of our Civil Rights Act.



Thank you, Members of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the previous speaker indicated, this Bill had a tremendous amount of debate a few days ago. But each and every one of us know that no Committee Hearings or real debate has been placed on this piece of legislation in the Senate. I think that just because we are in the waning hours of the Session we should not haphazardly go about and pass a major Civil Rights Bill that has wide range implications without knowing what we are doing. I think it's about time that the Members of the House quit bowing down to the Senate and reject this...reject this motion. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to offer a substitute motion that the House do not recede from Senate...from House Amendment #19 to Senate Bill 1377."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment. Representative Reilly, for what purpose do you rise? Reilly. Turn Reilly on."

Reilly: "On the point of order. The Gentleman previously in the chair ruled a few minutes ago that such a substitute motion, when objected to by the Sponsor, is out of order. Let's vote this up or down on my motion and go on with the business of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "All right, why don't we vote the Sponsor's motion up or down and...and go from there. Representative Chapman is recognized."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I disagree..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment...one moment, please."



Representative Emil Jones, for what purpose do you arise?"

Jones: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker. On a motion to recede, how many votes is required?"

Speaker Flinn: "To recede? 89 is final passage."

Jones: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman, continue. I apologize for the interruption."

Chapman: "On the last day of the Session, Mr. Speaker, we hear again and again the view expressed that it's time to go along with anything, whether we like it or not, to vote 'aye', to recede if we're asked to recede, to concur if we're asked to concur, just anything, no matter what the issues are involved, in order to get the job done so we can go home. I...I do not believe that this is the kind of view that this House of Representatives should be taking. We passed Senate Bill 1377 after spending many hours in considering Amendments. Amendment 19 is an excellent Amendment. It strengthens the Bill. I believe that we should go to Conference Committee and that we should put this Bill in the shape in which this Body can vote 'yes' and be proud that we voted 'yes'. I hope that you will refuse to recede from Amendment 19 to Senate Bill 1377."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of reasons that we ought to vote against this motion. Some of them are substantive and some of them are political. The substantive reasons are that requiring companies that...that issue credit to tell up front four simple little sentences on the credit applications, what the rights of people are, is



not too much to ask. Now there's some political reasons, too, that go to a phone call from the Chairman of the Republican Party in Cook County, who is not very happy with the Governor's attempt to impose a sales tax on Cook County. Now, I'm not suggesting that he is in...is...is in support of my strategy here, but I am suggesting that while the Governor of the State of Illinois is willing to accept input from the suburbs, he is not willing to change his plan substantively. And I believe this is as good a vehicle as any to tell him that we are not satisfied and we're not going to sit here and be puppets of the second floor, that we are Constitutionally elected officers, just as he is a Constitutionally elected officer and that we are going to go through the Constitutional process of consideration in legislation, which means deliberate...deliberation on legislation and that one cannot do with the transportation package that he is trying to sell the Members of this House. So, for both substantive reasons and for political reasons I think people should vote 'no' on this motion."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, is recognized."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to move the previous question but I'm interested in this debate so I think I'll hold off."

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear you. Representative Huff, Doug Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm...and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm initially rising on a point of inquiry to the Chair. I understand a substitute motion was made by Representative Jones. He...asked for a ruling of the Chair on his,"



Speaker Flinn: "One moment... You're appealing the ruling of the Chair that the substitute motion was out of order, is that what..."

Huff: "No, Sir. I'm rising originally on a point of inquiry as to the Chair's ruling on Representative...the Gentleman from..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I wasn't on the floor but I understand that the Chair previously had ruled that a substitute motion on a motion to recede would be out of order unless it is made by the Sponsor, of course."

Huff: "All right, then I would like to speak to the issue at hand."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Huff: "Thank you. During the debate of this Bill, 1377, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I did not speak on it because I was busy reading the Bill as it's constituted. And it raised grave Constitutional problems with me. It's ironic that we're asked to recede from Section 19. It was...it was this very Section in the Bill that gave me a great deal of problems and that Section dealt with jurisdiction, in which it allowed the state agency 160 days to determine whether or not it had jurisdiction in any application filed on a civil rights issue. I found this to be very inconsistent with the spirit and the intent of 1377. So if for not other reason I'm going to vote 'no' to recede from this and I think that ultimately this Bill, if we are thinking right, it should go to a Conference Committee. And so for that reason, if no other reason, I'm going to give this a negative vote and I wish everyone else would do so also because this is not impact on just minorities, it impacts on all of us here, whether



we be black, white, young or old. And I'm urging everyone to give us a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey. Do you decline? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will. I don't see him in his chair right now. There he goes."

Darrow: "I was wondering if this legislation is consistent with the Weber case and would it allow discrimination against whites in favor of blacks."

Reilly: "I've avoided rising on the point of issue..point of order although every speaker who's spoken since I've sat down has been out of order. The only issue here is whether we're going to recede or not recede from Amendment #19. But in any event, the Bill has nothing...even the whole Bill, even if we violate the rules of the House and discuss the whole Bill, has nothing to do with what that is at all, one way or the other."

Darrow: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is final passage. We're trying to create a record here that may be used in courts at a later date. I wish the Sponsor would address this Bill. We're taking final action. If he does not have the answers he could say so but I would wish he'd answer this question."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kane. Oh, I thought you were done. You sounded like you finished out. Leave Darrow on."

Reilly: "Would you repeat your question and I'll...I will..."

Darrow: "The question is, is this legislation consistent with the Weber case, in that it would allow discrimination against whites in favor of blacks?"

Reilly: "No. The...all the language in the Bill speaks in terms of taking action against someone on the



basis of race, religion, etc., so it would not."

Darrow: "No. Now, wait a minute. We do not talk about religion in this legislation. We've amended that provision out. Isn't that correct? On the State Affirmative Action Program?"

Reilly: "There's different Sections of the Bill that deal with different kinds of discrimination. But in terms of your question, which was whether this was consistent or not consistent with the Weber case. The answer to your question is that it is not, in the sense that the Bill speaks in terms of outlawing actions against people, not for...it does not speak or deal with the issue that the Weber case is dealing with, which was the reverse that is actions for a certain group or affirmative action as it's called."

Darrow: "Well does this legislation allow the state to set quotas?"

Reilly: "No."

Darrow: "All right, I'd like to address this legislation."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Darrow: "As we sit here in the closing hours the Representative from Will County often stands and speaks on these issues. And too often we don't listen close enough to what he says. He's a well learned individual, I respect his opinion, he's gone over this Bill, he's read it and he's completely and totally right. What this legislation does, number one, it eliminates color, religion, national origin, ancestry, age and marital status from the affirmative program of the State of Illinois. All that's left is race, sex and handicapped. So if you're constituents fall under any of the other categories, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, age or marital status, there's no



affirmative action program for them. Secondly, we have nothing but administrative procedures here. There are no criminal sanctions. Now, this is good, this is fine, if we have a sensitive administration. Wyvetter Young often times questions the various budgets that come into Appropriations Committee and she has created some sensitivity in these agencies. But if we have no sensitivity with the administration you're not going to have a good program. There will be nothing that can be done. At the present time we have criminal sanctions. When a case...like where there is an insensitive administration, the local states attorney can bring some action. This Bill is bad. This Bill should not be passed. The Representative from Will County is totally correct. We should send it back. We should work on some of these problems and pass out a good piece of legislation. I would solicit a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "I would move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor vote 'aye'...I mean, say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. I believe the 'no's' have it. Representative Kane is recognized."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of the things that we have heard today we heard once in Committee and we heard again on the floor of the House when this Bill was debated on Second Reading and again debated on Third Reading. And there are an awful lot of false statements and red-herrings that are being dragged around through



this debate. This is a Bill that simply reorganizes the three existing discriminatory agencies of the state into one agency. What it does is, it makes compliance easier, makes enforcement more understandable to both petitioners and respondents. It makes it easier for the state to enforce the rights of individuals if they are discriminated against because of race, sex, religion, or handicapped. When we had a Committee hearing on this Bill we had about 43 agencies come before the Committee and they represented the wide range of community groups involved with individual and human rights. We had the aged groups testifying for it, we had the retired groups, the groups that are involved with handicapped individuals. What you have heard in debate here is really two very contradictory kinds of things. Some people are trying to allege that this Bill breaks entirely new ground. Other people are alleging that this Bill goes far too far. I would say to the opponents of this Bill, and they oppose it for their own individual reasons and I won't characterize whatever their motives may be. But I would say to the opponents of this Bill, you can't have it both ways. You can't have half of the people stand up and say we're against this Bill because it goes far too far and then have others get up and say this Bill doesn't go far enough. It's inherently contradictory, the rest of us are not going to believe it. The question before us is whether or not the House should recede on House Amendment #19. It's been told that the Senate won't go along with the House. So I think that we adopted about 12 Amendments to this Bill on Second Reading in the



House and in the Committee hearing. The Senate went along with all of those Amendments. This was the only Amendment that the Senate refused to go along with. I think at this time that we have a choice of asking ourselves, is this a good Bill? Is this a good change for the state? Is it going to benefit people who are presently being discriminated against because of their age, because of their handicap, because of their sex, because of their race? And I think that if we answer that question dispassionately we have to say that, yes, this is a good Bill. This is a step in the right direction. We should not jeopardize it at this point. We should recede from this Amendment and then at some time later those of us who are interested in strengthening the state laws governing discrimination, that at that point we can get together and move forward. But I think that this is a step that we have to take at this time. We should recede from Amendment #19 and put Senate Bill 1377 onto the Governor's Desk. It's a major step forward for the...those individuals in this State who are discriminated against, not simply because of race but because of their sex, because of their handicap, because of their age. And I'd urge that the House recede from Amendment #19."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that Representative Kane in his usual articulate and common sense way has outlined for you the issues involved in what we're discussing here today. I sat on a Committee that is chaired by Representative Kane and to which this legislation was presented. And I think you



ought to listen to what the opponents are saying and you will find that diverse statements that just do not ring true. If you look at who testified in the Committee you will find that a wide range of groups who would be interested in this particular agency testified in support of this legislation. They did so because the Senate Sponsors, the Governor's Office and the House Sponsors have made every effort to bring all those groups together, to incorporate into this legislation the devices to express the real concern, to address what they are worried about in this legislation. You will find that the groups representing the handicapped, the groups representing various racial backgrounds, representing women, representing the elderly, presented their testimony on behalf of this legislation. Who were the opponents in Committee? The only opponents were Legislators in this Body or in this Legislature and that was it. A wide range of groups representing your constituents and my constituents, whether they be interested in a particular discriminatory action or whether they be representing business, who would also be affected by this agency, came into register their support for this legislation because they had been consulted beforehand. Because their concerns had been addressed in this legislation. What are we doing in this legislation? Very simply, and all I can do is repeat the words of the Chairman of the Committee, Doug Kane, we are taking three existing agencies and we are putting them into one. And I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that is why you are hearing, or some of the reasons you are hearing



quite a bit of controversy over this, because we are trying to streamline state government. We are trying to address conflicting concerns. And the fact that your constituents and my constituents came in and testified on behalf of this legislation indicates that the Sponsors have done their job and they have tried to address those concerns. Now we're talking here on what could be final action, receding from a House Amendment. The Sponsor and supporters of that Amendment are sincere in their desires. There are problems which they are trying to address and I do not feel that they are wrong in trying to represent their constituents and their concerns. But I think this is something that could be addressed at a future date and ought to be. I think that by receding from this Amendment that we will be doing our best to address the concerns of all the people of Illinois who are interested in human rights. And let's face it, that's what this issue is all about, human rights. I join with Representative Reilly, I join with Representative Kane, in urging that you vote to recede from Amendment #19."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative James Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Last Thursday night we debated this sensitive issue. And after 24 Amendments, and I think Representative Greiman...was Amendment #24. The Minority Leader came over to my desk and said we have a number of Amendments that we can accept if you will withdraw the other Amendments. I rose, I spoke to the issue, I gave a number to the Amendments that was to be withdrawn. And I think, in light of his word, that he told me that these Amendments would be accepted, I would have to rise in opposition



to your motion. All of you heard what happened here. I think Representative from Sangamon County here, didn't understand the person that he had down here to testify in behalf of this Bill. This Amendment is a good Amendment. It should be on the Bill and since we have already had an agreement that this Amendment will be accepted, I will ask you to vote 'no' against receding from this..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sam Wolf."

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

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

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when I arose to discuss the motion to recommit this Bill to Committee when we were on Second Reading I said to the House, that we met in a historic moment. Today, I must say, we meet in a silly moment. We're in the last hours of this Session, there are a lot of pressures on all of us, there are a lot of tough votes for all of us. In the midst of that people start making little deals, they start thinking about all kinds of things, they start, quote - unquote 'sending messages', whatever that may mean. But the issue here is very simple. I have tried; we presented a motion to concur on this Amendment in the Senate. A week ago the Bill got 11 votes in the Senate, on the motion to concur it got 6. That is the only issue before this House. We can not sell the



Senate on this Amendment. That's not my fault. Now those of you on my side of the aisle who may be thinking you're going to send the Message to the Governor. It isn't the Governor's Bill exclusively, it's my Bill and it's Representative Barnes Bill. So while you're sending messages, remember you're sending them to us. This is a good Bill, it reorganizes State Government in ways that will make it more efficient. It strengthens our ability to respond. To lose this Bill because of a dispute that the Senate simply won't accept over one part of that Bill, one small, even though important to the Sponsor of the Amendment and to many other people, a small part of that Bill, to lose the whole thing in a Conference Committee, which will not happen, would be tragic. I ask you, I beg you, I ask everyone on this side of the aisle who's ever paid any attention to me before, and Representative Barnes, I'm sure joins me on his side of the aisle, we need an 'aye' vote to put this Bill on the Governor's Desk. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall the House recede from Amendment #19 to Senate Bill 1377? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. And I'm going to give, two other people left their lights on, a long minute to explain their votes. Representative Giddy Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no one has more respect for the two Sponsors of this legislation than I do. They both know they were invited to a meeting of the women legislators to have...to explain in depth the reasons for the Bill, the Amendment to the Bill and to get our input at that point. So I am not trying to do the Bill in



or the concept in... However, I do think we should not recede from this particular Amendment. I think it can be passed if the will is there, with this Amendment in it. Now let me speak briefly just to this Amendment. This Amendment, you remember, only requires that on your credit card application that every company that's offering credit just four lines in telling consumers of their rights. Amoco Oil already does this. It's an international company, it doesn't present any problems. Master Charge does this. Visa does this. The only reason this Amendment went down in the Senate is that the American Express Company sent two... very attractive, very young, delightful women lawyers, I call them rope ladder women, because they've made it, they've made it through law school, they have good jobs, they're paid good salaries by American Express to come out here and lie to the Illinois Senate and kill this Bill. And they've made it. So they're pulling the rope ladder up behind them so that the women in Illinois who worked for years to achieve this legislation to get these four lines on credit cards will be placed a step backward. Now, I'm sorry, it has been said on this House floor before, there are those of us who are tired of being counted but not included. And so we really feel that this Amendment should go in the whole package that goes to the Governor's Desk. That's why I'm putting a red light on. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Susan Catania, to explain her vote. The second long minute, the second and last long minute."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I



was the Sponsor of Amendment 19 and I have been asked to explain my reasons for not wanting to recede from that Amendment. The Amendment was accepted here in the House. What it does is to make real what the Bill professes to do. On page 54, the Bill says, 'All credit card applications shall contain the following words verbatim', and then it states, 'four short, simple statements which simply enunciate the rights that we are supposed to have under Federal Law'. That's all it does. The Amendment requires that what the Bill professes to do really happens. It's not that big a deal. The Illinois Senate has no business doing it in. I don't think we should recede. I think my record on civil rights is clear. I don't think that a Conference Committee kills a Bill. The Governor wants this Bill. Many, many very powerful organizations want this Bill. A Conference Committee will not kill this Bill, if that's where it goes. I will certainly support getting good, strong legislation out of that Conference Committee, that's not over strong, mind you, not to kill it. Thank you for your votes to refuse to recede."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ray Ewell, to explain his vote. He declines. Representative Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going to try to be very brief, I didn't speak in the debate intentionally. Let me suggest to the Lady from Cook, who I have tried and many others have tried to work with all of the various things that she has proposed in trying to support her program. This measure was heard in the Senate on three occasions. The most



votes it has ever received in that Body is 11 at any given time. When it was heard for concurrence it received 6. The Lady from Cook knows very well that the Senate will not accept this kind of proposal. Let me say to the Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, if you wish for this Bill to go into Conference Committee, fine. But let me say also to the Members of the House, that there is no way that a Conference Committee Report with this language embodied in this Amendment, entered in that report, will get a favorable vote in the Senate. And the Lady from Cook knows that. Some of the Gentlemen from Cook also who is opposing this motion to recede also know that and the purpose, the purpose, the only sole purpose is doing here within this recession vote and in the Conference Committee what they could not do...they could not do on affirmative direct vote in this House. Now if you want to do that, you wish to do that, fine, go right ahead and do it, but let's not kid anybody in this House. The main purpose for putting this Bill in Conference Committee is another attempt to kill the whole concept. If that's what you wish to do, fine, go right ahead and do it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McClain, to explain his vote one minute, the timer is on. I'm going to have to put the stop clock on you. I'm sorry to start with you but... Okay."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe the issue is whether or not this Amendment is so important as to lose the whole concept. You know that we're faced with all kinds of issues today, transportation, corporate personal property tax, Department of Public Aid, Department of Children and Family Services. There are all



kinds of issues that are all high-priority issues for many of us. Now those issues will all have very close votes. All you have to do is have certain segments of certain groups to hold off votes on different issues in order to kill certain other Bills. I think we ought to wipe the Calendar as much as we can clean so that we can direct ourselves to the very tough issues and that's why I'm voting 'aye'. I think it's time to recede. I don't think that this Amendment is so critical to the concept and to the efforts that Representative Taylor's made, the black caucus has made, the women have made and others have made in order to make..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Gene Hoffman. Your 3 seconds went fast."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would suggest that in this time of the Session that we let issues stand and go up and down on their own merit. It was intimated by one of the previous speakers that for some other issue we should lay off or vote 'present' in order to send somebody a message. When we do that I think we send ourself a message and that message is that the inability of this Body to deal with issues as they stand or as they fall on their own merit. So for that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, as well as the reasons mentioned by the Sponsor, I believe this motion should be supported."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Reilly, do you wish to explain your vote further?"

Reilly: "No, Mr. Speaker, I would ask to put this on



Postponed Consideration and I will call it again after..."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm sorry, I had the timer on you."

Reilly: "I will call it again after we vote again on corporate personal and after we vote on the road program and all the message senders need my help."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. See you tomorrow. Postponed Consideration. Is Representative Laurino around? He was next up with 1217, Senate Bill 1217. Well take that one out of the record temporarily. Representative Stiehl, 1098. Representative Celeste Stiehl. 1098. I'm sorry. I forgot where I was at. I've got to make a declaration. Representative Taylor?"

Taylor: "I heard you say something about taking something out of the record. What..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Postponed Consideration. I took Laurino's Bill out."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "There was 70 votes on that one you were interested in. Alright. Let's back up to Laurino. You weren't in your seat, Bill. That's why I took you out of the record. 1217. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Laurino is recognized. Representative ... a motion on..."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we recede from Amendments 1 and 2 from Senate Bill 1217."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House recede from Senate Amend... House Amendments #2.. 1 and 2 from Senate Bill 1217. Any discussion? If not, all those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. An announcement by the Clerk while we're taking this Roll."

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 'ayes', 1 'nay', 8 recorded as 'present', and the House recesses from Senate (sic) Amendments 1 and 2 on Senate Bill 1217. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1098. Okay. Representative Stiehl. It's a House Bill. 1098. Cissy Stiehl. Out of the record. House Bill 905. Senate Bill 905. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, at this time I would move that the House recess from House Amendments 6, 7, and 8 to Senate Bill 905. The Senate refused to concur in these Amendments for what I will submit are reasons in the main that have nothing to do with the Bill. I've talked with each of the banking associations in this state, the Illinois Bankers, the Community Bankers, and AMBI, and they are in agreement that we can, indeed, give effect to this Bill. It is technically correct. We only attempted to spell out a few more things with most of the provisions of the other Amendments. As far as the banks are concerned, that we can live with the Bill in the form that it came to the House, and for those reasons I would move now that the House recess in these three Amendments. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Unknown: "Wait, wait. What's the message?"

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, I think we should clarify this. My understanding in speaking with you yesterday was that there were two separate messages sent to the House. Would you clarify which message is accurate with regard to the three Amendments, so that I could rephrase, if necessary, the motion. I know that yesterday..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well-taken. There was a



problem with the message that was originally received from the Senate. "Would the Clerk read the corrected message?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary and Mr. Speaker. I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to a Bill with the following title, to wit: Senate Bill 905 with House Amendments #6 and House Amendment #8. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following Amendment: House Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 905. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Stuffle: "Then I'm only dealing with Amendment #7. Is that correct?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Stuffle: "And, I would move that the House recede from Senate ...from House Amendment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Number 7."

Stuffle: "...#7 to Senate Bill 905."

Speaker Lechowicz: "905. On that motion is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor tell us what #7 is?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #7 for clarification. Mr. Cole ...Gentleman...Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Amendment #7 was an Amendment requested by the Savings and Loan League, which they purported was merely a technical Amendment. When it was presented to me, they indicated to me that they had ran this Amendment by the Commissioner of Savings and Loans. At that time, I asked them if, indeed, there was any possibility that the Amendment, which they claimed to be technical only, would in any way give credence to potential, additional branching authority by savings and loans. They indicated to me that it did not have that potential, that they had ran it by



by Commissioner, and I have found out since that that, indeed, was not the case. Yesterday the Commissioner of Savings and Loans indicated to the various banking organizations and to others with regard to this Amendment that, indeed, he believed there was a potential for branching by savings and loans if this Amendment were to be given effect on this Bill. For that reason and because I was merely attempting to give some support to the Savings and Loans and what they claimed was a technical Amendment, which is not possibly, which really has nothing to do with this Bill, persé, or with the issue of automatic terminals ...automatic teller machines rather, I'm moving to recede."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, will the Speak...will the Gentleman yield?"

Larry, with...with this Amendment it makes the legislation operative, is that correct? Or does it make it inoperative?"

Stuffle: "The Amendment has nothing to do with the operation of the rest of the Bill, whatsoever. I merely attempted to accommodate the savings and loan people with the Amendment, because they told me it was technical in nature, and that they wanted to go ahead and put it in, because they had a vehicle here to do so because the Bill otherwise affected them in terms of their powers under this Act and their powers under this Bill. So, at this time, I am moving to take this Amendment out and moving to recede, because I do not wish to see any potential court action over this issue, and I do not wish to give effect to any additional branching powers to the Savings and Loan if that were a possibility with that Amendment. My agreement extended only to the fact that I was lead to believe, as were others, that this was technical in nature, and it may well not be."

Mautino: "My final question, then would be since we are



addressing the question of facilities within this piece of legislation. If, in fact, any Amendments are offered in a Conference Committee to...if this goes to a Conference Committee, what are your intentions if, for example, a proposal for multi-bank holding companies were to be presented on this legislation?"

Stuffle: "Representative Mautino, if you will recall on Second Reading an effort was made in this House to attach the holding company legislation to this Bill. I rose at that time and said that all of the banking groups, as well as myself, opposed putting that on this Bill. Our position has not changed at all. I will not accept the holding company Amendment to this Bill. As far as I am concerned, and you know my position, I am opposed to holding companies. Others have different views, but I would reiterate that each of us and all of us, myself and all the banking groups, oppose putting that sort of Amendment on this Bill, as do I."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Purpose of an announcement, I believe. Mr. VonBoeck...on Mr. VonBoeckman's desk there's some soup and some change, and it's not his. So, whoever placed it there, would you kindly pick it up and give it to the right party. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize for not being on the floor when this Amendment was called. I'd like the Sponsor, please, to explain the Amendment again. I was down searching for the latest transportation plan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Skinner: "Not to close; to answer the question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, no, no, not to close."

Skinner: "Oh, Coles, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm recognizing him to answer your question."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Stuffle: "Did he ask the question?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you repeat your question, Sir?"

Skinner: "Just tell us what it does again, please."

Stuffle: "What this Amendment does?"

Skinner: "Yep."

Stuffle: "The Amendment provides...the Amendment...the Savings and Loan League, for the fourth time, Mr. Skinner..."

Skinner: "I heard that. I want to know what the Amendment does. It takes out something the savings and loan people wanted that the bank people don't want."

Stuffle: "Not at all, Representative Skinner, for the fourth time...for the fourth time in answering the same question for you now. The Amendment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Stuffle."

Skinner: "This is the first time for me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Skinner. For the record, would the Clerk read the corrected message. Could we have a little order in the House, please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Corrected message. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to a Bill with the following title: Senate Bill 905, which Amendments are as follows: House Amendment #6, House Amendment #7, and House Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 905."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now, the Calendar is correct. It's Amendments 6, 7, and 8. Now on that question, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, let me just ask the basic question, then. Who is...are...is this going to be...will this Bill, as amended, violate the Sherman or Clayton Anti-trust Act in that it will cut out savings and loans and credit unions of...from electronic banking?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stuffle, please. Leave them on."

Stuffle: "Representative Skinner, that is a question that I obviously can't answer. I am not a court of any competent jurisdiction. I don't know the answer to that question."



I think not, inasmuch as we're granting to banks, in this Bill, specific powers restricted to banks. I think you will find, and you know, that we don't have everything on the books for everybody in terms of everyone having the same authority at all times. I obviously can't answer that question. That's a question for the courts. The only question of anti-trust violations that I have heard raised on point with regard to this Bill or the other Bill, which is its companion, is with regard to who may indeed be involved with the activities on the switch and whether or not, if the state would have only one electronic facility switch, if that would be a violation of the Act. And, as you know, the other Bill provides for numerous switches throughout the state and numerous transmission facilities."

Skinner: "In one of the two Bills, does the provision still exist that any two hundred financial institutions may operate such a system?"

Stuffle: "The Bill...that is not on this Bill, Representative Skinner. That is on Senate Bill 906, which passed the Senate with 39 votes about an hour and a half ago, and that Bill says that you have to have two hundred banks involved in the creation of a facility that operates on a state-wide basis. However, that Bill also provides, as you know, for proprietary local systems to make transmissions and, indeed, under the provisions of that Bill there would have to be, by any way you cut it, a number of transmission facilities and not one. In fact, the reason that that particular Amendment...or that provision was put in the other Bill was to do the opposite of what I think you're driving at, and that is to create a situation where there would not be a monopoly, but rather to provide, there would be many banks involved, and those transmission facilities must be shared throughout the state, so that we would, in effect and in reality, prevent any monopoly



where one group or small group of bankers could, in any way, attempt to monopolize the system."

Skinner: "Well, you've mentioned the word, banker, several times. You haven't answered the question with regard to credit unions and with regard to savings and loans."

Stuffle: "Well, my understanding is that the way I read the Bills, the credit unions would still be in there. The credit unions now are involved in activities that banks are allowed to do by way of their general provisions in their Acts. There...I think you can raise a question about the activities of savings and loans, but my understanding of the Bills are that the definitions of financial institutions would include all types of financial institutions whether or not we were to spell out in the Savings and Loan Act or otherwise specifically that they had teller power."

Skinner: "I trust your presumption is correct. Thank you."

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

McAuliffe: "Let's move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. Have all...the question...all in favor say 'aye'. Opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, in closing, the House of Representatives acted on this particular Bill. We did, indeed, place Amendments on it. We did, indeed, attempt with the #7 in particular to accommodate the Savings and Loan League. We now find out that that particular Amendment was not what we thought it was or potentially it might not be with regard to the branching issue. Each of the banking groups in this state, as I said before, are in support of my motion to recede on this Bill from the three House Amendments. I would again reiterate my position that they are in concurrence with me that we can give effect to this legislation without those Amendments. The



Senate, indeed, sent this Bill back to us. In my firm opinion, not because of the issues presented by the Bill or the Amendments, but simply because of an effort on their part to stymie the entire issue. The arguments, if you were in the Senate, had absolutely nothing to do with the Bill, whatsoever, and I would move to recede at this time from Amendment 6, 7, and 8 to Senate Bill 905."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall the House recede from Amendment 6, 7, and 8 to Senate Bill 905?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, the timer shouldn't be on. I've had my light on all through this debate. My light was on the first lights was on, and I don't think that you should trample on people's rights. This was one of the most important measures to come before this Body, and you told us that we were taking and receding from one Amendment... Amendment #7, and that's not true. We're receding from three Amendments..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk read the corrected message."

O'Brien: "...6, 7, and 8, and we haven't even had a hearing in relation to the Amendments. I think that we ought to read what Amendment #6 does. It eliminates after...every...it eliminates everything after the enacting clause and replaces it with an amended...amendatory material making technical and clarifying and substantial changes. Amendment #6...8 does even more. Every Member, before he casts his vote, ought to read what we're rescinding to. I move to divide the question on the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "A little late. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the record and for posterity if there's ever a question on this, the parliamentarian has ruled that this takes 3/5 pursuant to Article 13, I believe, Section 8 of the Constitution. According to our



Rule 52, I believe it is, a 'present' vote would not be counted in that computation, so I would ask that you would now rule that three-fifths vote on this includes only the 'yes' and 'no' votes involved."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Chair is bound by the House Rules. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'ayes', 13 'nays', 21 'nos'...21 'present', and the Gentleman asked for a verification. The Gentleman is entitled to that, and we will poll the absentees. Yes, Sir. We'll poll the absentees. You can get on then." The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alexander. E. M. Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Barnes, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty. Bianco. Bradley. Catania. Chapman. Davis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Davis, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ralph Dunn. Ewell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ewell, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dwight Friedrich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Friedrich, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Garmisa. Goodwin. Hudson. Katz. Klosak. Kornowicz. Kulas. Marovitz. McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Marovitz, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Molloy. Peters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Peters...wait a minute. Peters, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Preston. Reilly. Schlickman. Schraeder. Sharp. Simms. Terzich. Vinson. Winchester. And Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Winchester, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Yes, they were polling the absentees. Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Mr. Wolf, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I have a conference at two o'clock. Could I have leave to be verified at this time?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be verified? Leave is granted. Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, for the same reason I wish to be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Laurino wants to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Garmisa. Garmisa wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Stearney. Mr. Stearney requests leave to be verified. and Mr. Richmond, and Mr...wait a minute. Is the Clerk writing these down? Kelly asks to be recorded as 'aye'. Terzich is 'aye'. Kornowicz is 'aye'. Reilly, 'aye'. Mr. Neff, 'aye'. All right. Mrs. Kent, for what purpose...Mrs. Kent wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Borchers, 'aye'. Mr. Ewing, 'aye'. Mr. Bianco, 'aye'. Mr. Sharp, 'aye'. Mr. McClain, 'aye'. On this question there are 131 'ayes', 13 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to withdraw my request for a verification because it seems like the votes are up there on the Board, but I just want to point out to the Speaker and to the Chair that something went on that I don't think ought to go on amidst the confusion in this room, and we were told by the Clerk that we were only going to recede from one Amendment, and the one Amendment that was talked about with the confusion on the House floor was Amendment #7. Then we were given a second message, which repeated that we were..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which corrected message?"

O'Brien: "A corrected message. Fine. Which indicated that we were going to recede from Amendment #6 and Amendment #8. I just want..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "#6, 7, and 8."

O'Brien: "That's correct. 6 and 8 in addition to the first message which was 7. I just want the Members to know that those two Amendments that we also receded from had a lot of important material in them. And nobody quite frankly knows what they voted on on that Bill and I don't think we



did the people of the State of Illinois any justice."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. As you know and the Members know I indeed did not attempt to do what the Gentleman just stated. I ask you indeed if there was a mistake because there was a conflict between the Calendar and the reading of the report from the Senate. In fact, I asked you twice and initially I explained all three Amendments. We then moved to the one and back to the three. We discussed each of them. In responding to Representative Skinner's question was a response as well as to #7, to the #6 Amendment, to the #8 Amendment in effect put the Bill back the way it was before it was amended. So we did indeed respond to those things and I thank you for the time to respond to Representative O'Brien on that particular issue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there's... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm still trying to read everything after the enacting clause. Record me as present."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Leverenz as present. On this question there's 130 'aye'.. the Lady from St.Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, record me as present please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please record the Lady as present. On this question there's 129 'aye', 13 'no', 34 present. And the House recesses from Amendments 6,7, and 8 to Senate Bill 905. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, voting on the prevailing side I move to reconsider the Roll by which the vote was taken."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I move that that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. 'Aye'.



Opposed. The motion carried... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima. I don't believe the other party is in the chamber, Larry. Clerk for an announcement."

Clerk O'Brien: "The pages are passing out a new Conference Committee history pending form time stamped 12:58 p.m. New form being passed out now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Speaker asked me to inform the Membership that we will now recess for an hour. Any announcements? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "For an announcement, Mr. Speaker. There will be a Conference of the suburban Republicans in room 118. 118 is the room we have, suburban Republicans immediately."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels at Mr. Leinenweber's desk."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there will be a conference of collar county Republicans in room 122-A immediately following recess."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further announcements? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "A conference of all Irish Democrats in my office over at the Stratton Office Building."

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

Terzich: "Yes, they'll be a Croatian conference between John Matijevich and myself sometime today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They'll be a conference of the only true minority in the whole State of Illinois, not to mention the House, and that'll be the Dutch in my office."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was going to request a Conference of all the Chicago independents in a phone booth. I suggest going outside in the lobby. Thank you."



~~Speaker Lechnowicz:~~ "I believe you were endorsed by the regular organization in the last election. The House will stand in recess for one hour.... Be back at 3:10..."

Speaker Redmond: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to the following Bills, Senate Bills 587, 971, 1150, and 580, action taken by the Senate June 30, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments the following Bills to wit; Senate Bill #588. I'm further instructed to inform the House, the Senate has refused to concur in Amendment #4. Action taken by the Senate June 30, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of thier Amendments to following Bills, to wit: Senate Bill 1272, I am further instructed the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur in House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1272, action taken by the Senate June 30th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 72nd Legislative Day, Friday, June 22, 1979. The House met pursuant to adjournment. Speaker in the Chair. Prayer by Father .. by Reverend George P. Harms, Pastor..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and the Journal be approved



as read. Journal #72 of June 22nd and Journal #73 of June 23rd, 1979 be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion.

Any discussion? Representative Giorgi, Representative Skinner didn't hear your motion ."

Giorgi: "Representative Skinner didn't hear my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you kindly repeat the motion?"

Giorgi: "While I have the floor, in answer to Skinner's motion, inasmuch as he didn't pay any attention and objected, it's going to cost the House more money to enroll and to transcribe and he's another one of the notorious Members of the House that refused to vote to pay for the wages of the House and refused to vote for Committee expenses and refused to vote for the expenses of the House. I thought maybe we ought to put that on the record so that he can explain his objection when he gets up to speak."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I've already explained that, Zeke. You just weren't listening."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Giorgi's motion that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with and that the Journal be approved as if read. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The reading of the Journal is dispensed with and the Journals are approved as read. Any Member have any Bill on the Order of Concurrence that he desires to nonconcur? Anything that has to go back to the Senate you'd better do it now or forever hold your peace. What is it? 9 what? House Bill 9 something. Representative Skinner on House Bill 9 something."

Skinner: "925, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "925."

Skinner: "Apparently we're not in agreement yet. So I would



ask that we have a second Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "What page is it on, do you know?"

Skinner: "Beats me."

Clenk O'Brien: "Conference Committee Reports, page 5."

Speaker Redmond: "925 on page 5. You move that we do not adopt the first Conference Committee report. Is that correct?"

Skinner: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. And the House does not accept and adopt the first Conference Committee report to House Bill 925. Let's try 14. See what happens here. On Conference Committee Reports, page 5. Representative Daniels, you here? 14; what do you want to do with Conference Committee Report? Okay. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 14. I'm advised that the Conference Committee Report has been adopted in the Senate. Basically what the Conference Committee Report does is provide that if you have been a continuous customer of the same water Commission for a minimum of 20 years, that you will be allowed to become a Member of that Water Commission. This is limited as far as we know to one area of the State. We know of no objections whatsoever to this report and I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1414. Final action. Representative Piel. the answer."

Piel: "A question, Mr. Speaker. Has this been distributed? We received the analysis, but we haven't received the report up here?"



Speaker Redmond: "Yes, it has. Representative Kempiners has it. If he has it, everybody has it. The question's 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 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report. 112, Deuster here? Out of the record. 580, Neff-Yourell. Is Neff here? You want to go with House Bill 580? Page 5."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with the Conference Committee Report on 580. It's been signed and is an agreed Bill.. Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Totten. Is Representative Dunn here? We need his signature on a Conference Committee Report."

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

Neff: "Yes, Don."

Totten: "Okay. The Conference Committee recommended that the Senate Amendment come off and the Bill be further amended as follows..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff..."

Totten: "What did the 'or follows' actually do? 'As follows' what did that actually do?"

Neff: "Yes, Representative Totten. All I did was technically change the category and there's no change been in the of the Bill. The Amendment that came over was a technical Amendment, but it was incorrect and so that's the reason we put the other one on and I said it made no changes in the Bill whatsoever."

Totten: "Thank you."

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



that the House adopt House... first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 580. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'aye' and 2 'no'. And the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 580. 751, is Steele or Kelly here? 751."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Chief Sponsor along with Representative Kelly of House Bill 751 I move to concur with the Conference Report on House Bill 751. The Senate Amendment that was put on this Bill caused some concern here in the House. We did not concur. It went to Conference. The Conference Report I believe satisfies some of the concerns that were expressed and in that it removes the cap on penalties for a train that blocks up to 30 minutes. The Conference Report provides ongoing penalties if a train continues to obstruct a crossing after 30 minutes. The Conference Report provides for a fine of \$500 for each five minutes thereafter, after 30 minutes. I think that this Bill puts the measure in a closer posture to that in which it passed the House. I think it solves some of the concerns expressed and I.. it was unanimously approved by the Conference Members and I vote .. move that we support this Conference Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 751. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 3 'no', and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 751. Sam Wolf here? Yeah. 838. Sam Wolf. 858 (sic)."



Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I move to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 838. This Conference Committee was made necessary as a result of a technical error in the Senate Amendment that was adopted by the House. As you recall the Bill had to be recalled and put in Conference Committee. It simply corrects two lines in the Amendment which deals with statistical fees by the Secretary of State's Office and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I.. It would be helpful if we don't run too fast cause if the Sponsor would have just explained the Bill and then what's... form the Bill is in now, because this is final passage."

Wolf: " Yes, Representative Totten. This Bill, House Bill 838, had to do with a revision of the statistical fees charged by the Secretary of State's Office and provided for a minimum ... a flat charge of \$200 on any request of statistical information and I don't have the Bill in front of me. I believe it changed the base rate per thousand from \$10 to \$20 per thousand. And in the Amendment that was adopted by the Senate, they wanted to provide that after the sum of \$200 to add in advance and require an addition a further sufficient deposit based upon the Secretary of State's estimate of the total cost of the information requested. The only problem with the Senate Amendment was that it corrected the wrong two lines and then this was the result of the Conference Committee Report."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill 838. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"



Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'aye' and one 'no'. And the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 838. 909. Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move that the House concur with the Conference Committee on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 909. The Amendment is actually the Bill now and it provides that coyotes may be taken by trapping methods only during the period from September 1 to March 1 and they may be taken by hunting methods at any time. I'd like to move that the House concur with the Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "They haven't put the bounties back in on this by any chance have they?"

Watson: "There is no bounty in this Bill."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt Conference Committee... the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 909. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'aye', 26 'no', and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 909. 925, I guess we took that one. It's too late. That's alright. Representative Braun? Representative Braun desires to be recorded as voting 'no' on that one. Guess you have to get up here and sign a sheet don't they? Yeah, you have to sign a slip here. 19.. er.. 1019. Oops. Representative Mahar? Representative Davis? I'll get to you."



I just skipped over that unintentionally. 1019,
Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen
of the House. I would move that the House do adopt
the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill
1019. It was signed by all Members of the Conference
Committee and this is the Bill that retains the initials
S.V. in the title of allotted vehicle title as opposed
to rebuilt. And I would ask for concurrence."

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

Schneider: "Bill, what was left in the Bill? Now, did you
take rebuilt off and leave RV on afterall?"

Mahar: "Yes, it was the consensus that it was a total agree-
ment by all parties concerned that we would go with
the initial SV as opposed to rebuilt. And we reaffirmed
that in the Conference and reaffirmed the agreement
and we're back and I'm asking that we would concur
with that."

Schneider: "Well, I have no real interest in that except
that I know the House was opposed to the notion of
deleting rebuilt which is more definitive rather than
accepting the alphabetical or letter designation so
I.. I recall that I voted against it for reasons that
other Members pointed out and those same Members want
to reiterate their vote. It's an identical package then
that we sent out from the House to the Senate and
it came back. So I suggest maybe a 'no' vote on this."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen
of the House. I have discussed the matter with the
individuals on the House floor who have some objections
and explained to them the background of this legislation,
the length of time we've worked upon the need for
some compromise in order to get something on the books .

If we don't have a compromise among all parties concerned this is a very... it's a very involved situation as far as the numbers of people that are concerned, we end up with nothing. And certainly I think that you would agree that there is a need to have some step forward in this area."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Well, I... Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to respond to Representative Schneider's question since I was one of those people who raised questions and objections for the use of the initials S.V. in place of the word 'rebuilt'. The Secretary of State along with Representative Mahar, that is Representatives of the Secretary of State's Office, have indicated to us that their original intention... their original intention was to use this as a crime fighting anti-chop shop piece of legislation. And I have in my hand a memorandum from Jean Flinn, the Legislative liaison for the Secretary of State's Office in which she states that it appears that the original intent of the Bill would be fulfilled by the use of the initials S.V. Since they are fearful without that compromise of using S.V. instead of 'rebuilt' that certain interests which feel that they would lose the sale of these rebuilt type cars would oppose it and it would not receive sufficient votes for passage and they would have no legislation. She has asked that we concur in this Conference Committee Report, that we accept S.V. I personally do not believe it is good. It is not as strong from a consumer viewpoint. I am, however, willing to accept and have signed the Conference Committee Report in the interests that it's better to take the anti-crime S.V. which would put police on notice that the vehicle was a rebuilt vehicle, that it had been subject to use of salvage parts, possibly chop-shop parts. I'm willing



to accept that at the Secretary's request and I am not going to oppose the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and Members, with that explanation I'll withdraw my objection."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that, Representative Schneider?"

Oh, okay. The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1019. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Senator Philips, will you stay in the chamber a moment? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Senator Philips, will you stay in the chamber a minute? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 9 'nay'. And the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1019."

Speaker Redmond: "On page 4 under the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2618. Representative Br.. Representative 'Broom.' Senator Phillips."

McBroom: "Yes, 'Speaker Redway', this is Representative 'Broom' and I appreciate you and Mr. Madigan taking the hold off of this important piece of legislation. I would move that the House concur with Senate Amendments. The Amendment would provide that the State Central Committee of each political party would make a ..."

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

Epton: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. I believe you recognized Senator Broom and then you recognized perhaps Senator Philip and I don't see either one of the Gentlemen on the floor and I don't know who the devil is speaking on this Bill. If he can't identify himself, I suggest he get off the floor of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "He's the head of the Department. Senator Broom."

McBroom: "Thank you, my friend, Mr. Epton. The effect of this Amendment would be that candidates for delegates would no longer have to designate which candidate they were going to be for for President. It occurs to me that this is a very worthwhile and significant Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Some candidates, and I told one of the Members of the press here, it seems that the press... and I.. I use this as an illustration, not to condemn the media, but it seems that individuals who are.. that are sometimes glamourized in the Legislature are those who have an independent flair. It occurs to me that there are people who are independent in both political parties who would like to run for delegate or alternate delegate to the National Convention and really and truly want to go the Convention to evaluate the merits of the candidates to see if the candidate that they are inclined to is actually going to



be a candidate at the time of the Convention and if that individual that really is not committed to Mr. Carter or Mr. Dole, or whomever the candidate might be, I see no reason why if he's genuinely... genuinely independent, genuinely concerned as to who the candidate might be, wants to evaluate the candidate, why then must he have to have the rather weak, vacillating, unflattering connotation after his name 'uncommitted'? It occurs to me also, for the benefit of the Democratic party and the Republican party both, that it would.. it will be a way of being less decisive by having us a group of Dole candidates, a group of Carter candidates, a group of Phil Crane candidates, on and on. I think it would less fracture both political parties by letting individuals run as they did a few years without designation of a Presidential candidate. I'm going to conclude here in just a minute, Mr. Speaker, and I'd be glad to respond to any questions. But, it just occurs to me that this is the way to go and I would solicit a green vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion to concur and for a number of reasons which I'd like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House. First of all, this was one of those vehicle Bills that we, unfortunately, let out of this House and out of the Elections Committee. It was simply a Bill that removed the provision for the allowing of nicknames to be used on the ballot. Now, the Senate has seen fit to make the Bill into one of the more significant measures affecting party primaries and the selection process that candidates go through. It can be more aptly titled 'the wheeler-dealer Amendment,' because what this Bill would now do is to allow a few Members of a political party to determine if they wanted to broker or use leverage



to determine how that delegation would go. And it seems to me that at a time that we want to encourage people to vote in a political primary and to encourage them to help nominate the candidate of their choice, to remove the provision that we wisely put into our law allowing people to have a commitment or a candidate declaration next to their name, that this would be a sad mistake. Now we would have maybe some 15 or 20 names on the ballot and the voter would not know who is... who that candidate may be favoring at the time of the convention. It takes away from the voter a reason for going to vote in a primary. And it seems contrary to the wishes of, not only the people, but many Members of this House, in efforts that have been made to try and increase primary turn out by trying to put confusion into the whole process as this Bill would do. Let me point out further that I find this difficult coming from our own party, a party that has traditionally talked about the voter's in-put into the selection process. Well, let me tell you, that traditionally the party through the Republican Workshop Program has said that one of the major reasons for going to vote in a primary is that that is the only time you can determine who your party's nominees are. Well, if this Bill goes into effect, less than one-third of the Members of our political party will be determining whether there are party declarations on the ballot. And I don't think 8 Members of a State Central Committee should have the option for determining what 11 million people in this state may be faced with. In addition, let me point out that this is completely contrary to the move to an open primary. There are many people in this General Assembly, and I don't necessarily agree with them on the issue, that would like to see an open primary. This is an absolute contradiction to that concept because it would absolutely foreclose and preclude the voter's choices in determining how delegates



and how delegations would be formed in going to a convention. In addition, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to allow such a small group of people to determine the fate, I think lies in contradiction to the tenet of not only our political party, but that Democrats from both downstate and suburban areas ought to look at the measures that are in this Bill because it could very well affect your political party as well as ours. I think this is a dangerous measure. It's a measure that to be deliberated at this point in the General Assembly is a sad mistake and I think that the whole procedure that we are about to get into is a disastrous one and this concurrence ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition also to this concurrence. I have a great deal of respect for the Sponsor of this legislation. However, I think the Amendments that were placed on this Bill on the concurrence, very frankly, are anti-people oriented. The people of both political parties have the right to know who they want as their candidate for President of the United States and correspondingly, they have the right to know which delegates that are running that are going to that convention committed to vote for that individual for the highest office in the land. I don't think we want to go back to the days to turn our political process over and either political party to the political bosses that allow just a very few individuals to dictate who the candidate is going to be for either political party. And very frankly, we are taking away from the voters of Illinois, the independence of the voters of Illinois, the right to be selective and be a participant, a direct participant, in the electoral process of electing our candidate that will be the standard bearer of our own political party in the November election. And I suggest



to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this has the ramifications of being a party hack and a party bosses Bill where they can control delegations by not allowing individuals to declare themselves and placing glamorous names on the ballot of people that are well known in the community or the district that have no political affiliation to any one candidate but can be controlled by the political bosses either in Chicago or Springfield. I would suggest to you that the best thing for the citizens of this state is to reject this Conference Committee of this concurrence and send this Bill to a Conference Committee report and take this objectionable part of this legislation out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor of this asked that he'd be willing to answer any questions. Well, I don't have to ask any questions. I know just very well what this is all about, this Amendment. As a Member of the Elections Committee in the House I thought the Bill was sort of a dumb... little Bill, but I voted for it, never dreaming it was going to be used as a vehicle to put this horrendous Amendment on. It reminds me of the primary lock-out Bill two years ago when we had the same philosophy trying to foisted upon us, keep the people out, you know. Let the old party hacks run the party. It's a terrible Amendment. The election of delegates is not a popularity contest. It isn't so much the person, it's rather who that person wants to vote for in the convention. This is simply... and we ...find. Representative Willer agree with Representative Totten and Simms sort of a strange coalition but they're absolutely right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well this has all been a very tough act to follow. Representative Totten said it very well. I just want to stand up and raise my voice in opposition to this awful Bill



which will close off all options to the people of the State of Illinois. I hope you're all listening in both political parties on both sides of the aisle. This Bill will absolutely destroy the primary system as we know it in this state as far as National Conventions are concerned."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This might be called, 'the blind primary Bill'. We haven't seen... we haven't been able to get very... We haven't been very successful with open primaries in this state. So now we're going to try a blind primary. Representative Willer said it very well. She's in agreement with Representative Totten and Simms and so am I. And I urge a 'no' vote on this terrible, terrible Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill doesn't seem to be getting a whole lot of support, but I would like to ask the Sponsor a question. I think I know the answer, but, Representative McBroom, do I understand that in Presidential preference primaries now, that if this Bill passes it would no longer be possible for a candidate for a delegate to show after his name the Presidential candidate to which he would ... is committed?"

McBroom: "You're partially correct. Each State Central Committee by Majority vote, Representative Schuneman, could make a determination whether or not the potential Republican and Democrat candidates could be removed. Now, my.. part of the purpose that I.. why I agree with Senator Philip totally is that, and I'd like to repeat it one more time, Representative Schuneman in answer to your question. It occurs to me and I feel very strongly that there are some Republicans and some Democrats that are truly uncommitted and undecided. And I.. as I said earlier, why should that individual be penalized and have to put off behind his name the weak, vacillating, unflattering connotation, namely, uncommitted?"



That's part of the reason for it and some of the other ... the other answer to your question, Representative Schuneman, I can envision and I'm sure you can, particularly with the number of Republican candidates being talked about, that some of the individuals that you might be supportive of now might not even be a candidate come convention time."

Schuneman: "Well, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak briefly to the Bill. I am in opposition to the Senate Amendment for the simple reason that I believe many people who vote in Presidential primaries are not very familiar with the delegates that are running and if it's possible for a delegate to indicate after his name the candidate to which he is committed, the voter gets an idea from that about the political philosophy of that delegate. And I think that is very, very important and that's a right that the voters have and I think we would be making a bad mistake to remove that right from the voter. And I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this bad Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to concurrence in this Senate Amendment. I think this is taking the authority away from the grass roots people to determine who they want to express themselves for in any primary to determine who they want to be for candidate within that primary for President. And I positively think this is the wrong approach. You're taking that authority away from them and after all, that's what this country was built on. And I ask you to vote 'no' on the concurrence."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Amendment also. I think Representative Schuneman hit it right on the head."



The people are not familiar with candidates, or may not be familiar with candidates who are running for the position of delegate. And so, as a result, the better known name, the party name, the name that has appeared in the press might be the one that would catch their eye to receive their vote for delegate when, in fact, this defeats the whole purpose of the delegate selection. People are not going in to vote for the delegate himself, but for the person who will represent them best in selecting the party..who they think should represent their party. I think that this is a step backward, a giant step backward in removing the people from the selection process of delegate. They're not interested in who the delegate is... that delegate is himself. They're interested in sending somebody to the convention who will vote and select the candidate that they want to lead their party and carry the party banner. They want the person that they think is best qualified for President of the United States. And, most importantly, when we put this in the shape that it is in now, it was the idea of the Legislature to involve the people in the selection process, to involve the people in the selection process of the candidate and hopefully, ultimately, the President of the United States. I think this is a very bad idea. I think it's important that the people select their delegates and select the delegates that they think will represent them in convention and represent their interests that they think is in their best interests. I call for an overwhelming vote of.. negative vote on this concurrence. I think it's a very bad idea. I think we have a very good law in Illinois right now and I think we ought to keep it that way."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig moves the previous



question. Those in.. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'nay', and the main question is put. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, to close."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am somewhat amused by the responses of some of the Members whom I have the highest regard for. It reminds me of a statement that Senator Partee used to make. He used to say that's a very good reason and if we wait a day or two, we may find out what the real reason is. I am inclined and must suggest that some of the opposition comes to this Bill comes because of loyalty to a candidate whose day has passed and he belongs to the same political party that I do. I also find it necessary to point out that I have talked to candidates for delegates in the past who have prostituted themselves by putting the name of the most popular Presidential candidate in that district behind their name when they had no intention of supporting that candidate when they got to the convention. They picked a name that would run well in Lake County, Representative Matijevich, or Kankakee County, with no intention of supporting that candidate when they got to the convention. It is not binding simply because Representative Campbell puts Senator Dole's name. There's nothing binding about it. He's morally obligated, but it's not binding. I would solicit a favorable Roll Call on this very good piece of legislation."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2618. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last Speaker in closing is absolutely right. I've been involved in seven National Conventions. And that is



exactly what happens.. When you tell... when you think that you're getting the people to give you their input in the selection of a candidate, out of the seven National Conventions that I've been involved in only one time that I can remember that the designatee went down and voted for the candidate. It makes you look foolish to the people back home when they meet in the caucus and they caucus themselves into an entirely different candidate than they designated they would go down and support. This is a farce. It's a fraud. It's a fraud on the people that sent you down. They voted for you because you were going down to vote for a certain candidate and when you get locked in the caucus at a National Convention you find that you have to go home very embarrassed to face the people who elected you. I support the.. this Bill. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative

Deuster, to explain his vote. One minute."

Deuster: "If you want to send a delegate to the Democratic Convention or the Republican Convention and not a puppet, vote 'yes'. The purpose of a convention is to send experienced Democrats and experienced Republicans down there and we have to chose them in March in Illinois so then in July at that time, they'll use their best judgement to nominate for our two major parties the best person President and the best platform and the best Vice Presidential candidate. I think you should.. you should vote 'yes' to send delegates who will use their judgement and their experience as individual persons to at that time chose who is going to be the candidates and the platform of your party and I urge many more green votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The .. Have all voted? The Gentleman from... Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 'ayes' and 70 'nays', 7 answering 'present'. And the Gentleman



from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, the Sponsor of the Bill."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your calling the absentees."

Speaker Matijevich: "And the Clerk will call the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; E.M. Barnes. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Catania, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Daniels. Domico. Doyle. Ewell. Farley. Gaines..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment please. This may change something. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Change my vote from 'present' to 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "From 'present' to 'aye'. Kosinski... let's take another Roll Call. I thought this might change things. Alright. I just hope this isn't part of the deal. Just one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if Mr. Madigan will explain his vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'd rather he didn't. The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2618?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are... just one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise?"

Totten: "If it gets 89, I want to verify it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Eighty-seven 'aye'; 71 'nay'; e answering 'present'. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative McBroom, asks for a poll of the absentees. Gaines 'aye'. Slape. The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape. Slape."



Slape: "Mr. Speaker, if this gets 89 votes, I'd like to have a verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "We...we got a request on both sides now. Representative Satterthwaite, 'no'. Satterthwaite, 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, again."

Totten: "Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I didn't know for sure if the Governor was for this. Apparently he is as I see his top henchmen are now lobbying Members on our side of the aisle. It's undoubtedly an attempt by the Governor to control our delegation."

Speaker Matijevich: "I...I don't mind them lobbying on this thing, Don. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. E. M. Barnes. Cullerton. Ewell. Farley. Getty. Dave Jones. Kane. Klosak. Molloy. Richmond. Schlickman. Stuffle. J. J. Wolf. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels. Change Daniels from 'no' to 'aye'. Dan O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record O'Brien from 'present' to 'aye'. Leon. Leave for Leon to be verified. Leave. All right. Where...where do we start out at, Mr. Clerk? Ninety 'ayes', seventy-one 'nos', and the Clerk will call out the affirmative vote. One moment. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Gene Hoffman. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Beatty."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Members wave their hands when your name is called? All right. Continue."

Clerk Leone: "Bell."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Hoxsey, for what purpose do you rise? Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Change...change my vote to 'aye', please."



Speaker Matijeich: "Hoxsey from 'no' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "Griesheimer, 'aye'. Continue with the affirmative...Mulcahey. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified now?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Leave to verify Mulcahey. Leave. Proceed. Dunn. Leave to be verified. Dunn asked leave. Leave. That was John Dunn. John Dunn. He's 'no', but...all right. Continue with the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Bell. Bianco. Boucek. Bower. Capparelli. Capuzi. Conti. Daniels. Darrow. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capuzi. Leave to be verified. Leave. You have leave. Jim McCourt. The Gentleman from Cook, Jim McCourt. McCourt."

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

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

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

McCourt: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeich: "Change McCourt from 'no' to 'aye'. Continue with the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huff. Huskey. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kelly. Kempiners. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Matijeich. Matula. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Mulcahey. O'Brien. Patrick. Piel. Polk. Pouncey."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Kulas."



Kulas: "Speaker, can I ask...have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Kulas to be verified. Leave.

Continue with the Roll...affirmative vote. Jim Keane,
'aye'. Keane, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Polk. Pouncey. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Rigney.
Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Stanley. Stearney. C. M. Stiehl.
Swanstrom. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek.
Waddell. White. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. Sam
Wolf. Younge. And Yourell."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gent...Wolf, 'aye'. Wolf, 'aye'.
Rea, 'no'. J. J. Wolf, 'aye'. Jim Rea, 'no'. The
Gentle...Abram...Abramson. Abramson."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "How's the Gentleman recorded? Abramson?"

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

Abramson: "Can I...can I change my vote to 'aye', and can I
be verified also?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Change...change Abramson to 'aye', and
he's verified. The Gentleman from Cook, Ronald Reagan.
I mean, Don Totten, on the verification."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Where are we starting?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Where do we start? Ninety-five 'ayes',
60 'no'. Ninety-five."

Totten: "McGrew."

Speaker Matijevich: "Do you...is Eugenia Chapman within ear-
shot? She is? Would she please come up? McGrew. How's
...I don't see the Gentleman in the chambers. How's he
recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off. Continue."

Totten: "Bianco."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bianco? I don't see Bianco in the back.
Oh, yes. There. He's way in back."

Totten: "Darrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Clarence Darrow? I don't see the Gentle-



man in his seat. He's not in the chamber. How's he 142.
recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Totten: "Daniels."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who? Who was that? Daniels? Oh, right
here."

Totten: "Dawson."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, he changed. Dawson? I don't see the
Gentleman in his seat. Glen Dawson. He's not in the
chamber. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Totten: "Garmisa."

Speaker Matijevich: "Garmisa is in his seat."

Totten: "Hanahan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hanahan is in somebody else's seat."

Totten: "Hannig."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hannig is in his own seat."

Totten: "Harris."

Speaker Matijevich: "Harris. Bill Harris. I don't see him
in his seat. I don't see him on the floor. How's he
recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Continue."

Totten: "Henry."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who was that?"

Totten: "Henry."

Speaker Matijevich: "Henry is in the back."

Totten: "Leverenz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leverenz is by his seat."

Totten: "Hoffman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gene Hoffman. He had leave to be veri-
fied."

Totten: "Lechowicz."



Speaker Matijevich: "Return Glen Dawson on the Roll Call.

Lechowicz is not in his seat. Is Lechowicz in the Assembly? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Totten: "Patrick."

Speaker Matijevich: "Langdon Patrick is in the back, in his seat."

Totten: "Rea."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jim Rea voted 'no'."

Totten: "Ropp."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gordon Ropp is at his seat."

Totten: "C.M. Stiehl."

Speaker Matijevich: "C.M. Stiehl? I don't see her in the back. I don't see Celeste Stiehl. How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove her. Return Bill Harris and Lechowicz. Harris and Lechowicz are returned to the Roll."

Totten: "Terzich."

Speaker Matijevich: "Terzich is up front quarter backing."

Totten: "Ropp."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who?"

Totten: "Oh, I did him. Williams."

Speaker Matijevich: "Williams is in his seat and return Celeste Stiehl to the Roll Call."

Totten: "Boucek."

Speaker Matijevich: "Boucek, Emil Boucek is way in the back."

Totten: "Doyle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Doyle is in his seat."

Totten: "Leon."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leon had leave to be verified."

Totten: "Ryan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ryan? Is the Minority Leader on the floor? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him for a while. Continue."

Totten: "Jake Wolf."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wolf had leave. Continue. Have we put Bill Harris on? Yeah, he is returned."

Totten: "I think Bill wanted to change his vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Do you have anymore questions of the Affirmative.."

Totten: "No more questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "What's the count? Return Ryan to the Roll Call. Farley 'aye'. Farley 'aye' and we returned Ryan. And do we have a final count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 94 'ayes', and 68 'nos', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2618. This Bill, having received the Constitutional.. Oh, no. The Gentleman from Cook... Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "... Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McBroom, having voted on the prevailing side moves to reconsider the vote by which the House concurred with Senate Amendment #1 and Bill Kempiners moves that that lie on the table. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And it is tabled. House... House Bill 440, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate has voted to not accept the Confer... first Conference Report on House Bill 440. I would ask that a second Conference be appointed."

Speaker Matijevich "I didn't hear that, Representative Cullerton. What?"

Cullerton: "The Senate has voted not to accept the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 440.... House Bill 440. I'm asking for a second Conference Committee to be appointed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman has (is) moving



that we not adopt the Conference Committee and ask for a second Conference Committee on Senate Bill... House Bill 440. Is that it? 440. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And it is so carried. Alright. We... We're going to be honored with our Commander in Chief again, Veteran's Affairs, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Larry DiPrima on a order of business that I don't even know about yet. Alright. Larry DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last Session Susan Catania and I introduced a Resolution urging the Congress to mint a coin in honor of her patron Saint Susan Anthony. Well, you know, at the time we both said we were going to send for one and the upshot was we never did and then Piel... Representative Piel I guess had one from one of his friends and showed it to her and that's about all she's seen of one. So now this morning Katz came up to me and ... Susan, where are you at? For Christ's sake. Ain't she even here? Susan Catania get over here wherever you're at. She's always running around the place like Penny Pullen. Oh, get up here. So now, as I was saying, 'Senator' Katz had more foresight than Susie and I and he did send for one of these new minted Susan Anthony coins and with the compliments of Senator... Representative Harold Katz, Susie, I'm going to present you with a Susan Anthony coin."

Catania: "Thank you very much. You realize that these aren't going to be released until tomorrow. I guess they had to smuggle this out of a bank somewhere. I recognize her profile of course, because I've got her picture on the diaper bag that I've had on the House floor with all of my babies. Thank you Harold. Thank you Larry. I really appreciate it."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. And I would like the record to show that the time is now 4:45 p.m. At 4:30 p.m. I went to room 400. I received a notice two minutes before for a conference on Senate Bill 669. No one was there. I waited for 15 minutes before coming back to the chamber and I've been advised that a number of the Senate staff has been around collecting signatures about quarter after four, 15 minutes before the appointed time. I think this is a gross.. one of the grossest things we'd had to put up for a long time. I resent it and I will speak more about that when that Conference Committee Report comes to the floor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Your point's well taken. We'll do two quick ones. House Bill 2376 on page 4, Betty Lou Reed. er.. I'm not sure what page it is. House Bill 2376, is that it? Proceed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the questions raised in regards to the compensation or granting of easement rights have not been addressed in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2376. And I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reed moves to nonconcur on House Bill 2376, on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2376. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2376. House Bill 829, the Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1,2, and 3 to House Bill 829. Senate Amendment #1 changed the definition of 'private not-for-profit' university of college to include a two year pro-



gram offering courses which can be applied to obtaining such bachelor degree. It adds seven institutions in the State of Illinois. Senate Amendment #2 clarifies the definition of construction projects by providing that reconstruction or rehabilitation work is to be done on existing buildings and existing structures therefore not any new construction. And Senate Amendment #3 provides safeguards against the private college receiving assistance from the provisions wherein the Amendment states, 'the State shall be reimbursed for the unused portion of the pre-determined life of the money and that there shall be a lien on the university property of the State of Illinois'. And I would move to concur on these three Senate Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McClain moves to concur on Senate Amendments #1,2 and 3 to House Bill 829. If there's no discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. It's final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkinbine, to explain his vote."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote because I don't think very many people are aware of what this does. This increases the amount and the possibility of public monies going to private universities and private schools. As a supporter of private universities and private schools I think it's dangerous because anybody who has looked at it knows that public control always follows public money. I don't think it's good for us to get involved with it. I suggest a 'no' vote. Thank you."

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



Kempiners: "A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker?
Mr. Speaker?"

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

Kempiners: "I've been keeping track of the Conference... Is
this Conference Committee or Concurrence?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Concurrence."

Kempiners: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? Have all
voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On
this question there are 93 'aye', 46 'nay', 6 voting
'present'. And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Birkinbine, for what purpose do you arise?"

Birkinbine: "I'd like to verify the vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks for a verification
of the affirmative vote and Representative McClain
asks for a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "E.M. Barnes. Bowman. Capuzi. Catania.
Christensen. Daniels. DiPrima. John Dunn. Ralph
Dunn..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Barnes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Ewell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kornowicz 'aye'. Richmond 'aye'.
Kornowicz 'aye' and Richmond 'aye'. And Commander
DiPrima 'aye'. And Sandquist 'aye'. Bell 'no'. Do
you still persist? Where's the John at? Kempiners.
The Gentleman from Will, Representative Bill Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Change me to.. from 'present' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kempiners 'aye'. What's our count,
Mr. Clerk? 98 'aye's and 46 'no's. Do you still
persist? Where's Birkinbine? Alright. Yes. Continue
with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Klosak. Kosinski.
Marovitz. McCourt. Molloy. Peters. Reilly."



Speaker Matijevich: "Bower 'aye'. Reilly 'aye'. Bower 'no'. Reilly 'aye'. Skinner 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kosinski 'aye'. Dunn, what did you want? 'No'. Ralph Dunn 'no'."

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

Reilly. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Vitek..."

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

Birkinbine: "Excuse, Mr. Speaker, but part way through the call we switched from calling off the absentees to verifying the affirmative."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright. We're sorry about that. That's the first mistake the Clerk has ever made."

Clerk Leone: "Reilly was absentee and he changed to 'yes' and then I got off track."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Proceed with the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Robbins. Ropp. Schlickman. Schraeder..."

Speaker Flinn: "Robbins votes 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Stearney. Stuffle. Van Duyne. VonBoeckman. Watson. and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "That completes the poll of the absentees. Proceed with the polling of the affirmative vote."

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

Speaker Flinn: "One moment please. Representative Birkinbine, you're entitled to have somebody up here if you want. Send someone up with a piece of paper and ... we've been doing that in order to keep from fighting the crowd and standing all the time. You can't get them to sit down. Okay. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with a poll of the affirmative . Anderson. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bluthardt. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock.



Campbell. Capparelli. Chapman. Collins. Cullerton.
 Currie. Darrow. Dawson. Davis. Deuster. DiPrima.
 Domico. Donovan. Doyle. Dyer. Ewing. Farley.
 Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty.
 Giorgi. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock.
 Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey.
 Huff. Dave Jones. Keane. Kelly. Kempiners. Kornowicz.
 Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino.
 Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Madigan. Mahar.
 Margulas. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain.
 McGrew..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich asked permission to be verified. Permission granted. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Reilly. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Sharp. Slape.."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman wishes to be verified. Verified. Proceed." Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can I vote 'aye' and be verified, please?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady votes 'aye' and wishes to be verified. She's verified. Representative Carol Braun? Carol Braun? At Barnes' station. Carol Braun verified. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with a poll of the affirmative. Steczo. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Vitek. Waddell. Walsh. White. Williams. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Younge. and Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, how do you wish to vote on this issue? Mr. Speaker? Mr. Redmond? What is the count, Mr. Clerk? We're starting out with 101 'aye' and 50 'nay's. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Record me 'aye' please."

Speaker Flinn: "Vinson 'aye'. 102 'aye's. Representative



Birkinbine. Questions on the affirmative vote."

Birkinbine: "Mr. Bianco?"

Speaker Flinn: "Who was that?"

Birkinbine: "Mr. Bianco?"

Speaker Flinn: "Bianco. Bianco, he's back there. There he is."

Birkinbine: "Mr. Bluthardt."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I'd like to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Walsh from 'aye' to 'no' and Jane Barnes wishes to be changed to 'aye'. Jane Barnes 'aye'."

Birkinbine: "Representen..."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, proceed with questions of the affirmative."

Birkinbine: "Representative Bluthardt."

Speaker Flinn: "Bluthardt? He's there in his seat."

Birkinbine: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Flinn: "A little louder. I couldn't hear you."

Birkinbine: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Flinn: "Phil Collins? The Gentleman is not in his seat. He's in the back."

Birkinbine: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Flinn: "Darrow? Clarence Darrow? I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Representative Willer. Willer?"

Willer: "Yes. Vote me 'yes' please."

Speaker Flinn: "Vote Willer 'aye'. Proceed with the questions of the affirmative."

Birkinbine: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Flinn: "Garmisa. The Gentleman is in his seat."

Birkinbine: "Representative Hanahan."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hanahan? The Gentleman is at his seat."

Birkinbine: "Representative Hoffman?"

Speaker Flinn: "Gene Hoffman. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? There he is. What? No. That's not.... Representative Marovitz. Marovitz."

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

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Marovitz: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Marovitz 'aye'. And Gene Hoffman is not on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Representative Schlickman. Schlickman 'aye'. Proceed. Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Representative Lechowicz."

Speaker Flinn: "Lechowicz? In his seat. Representative Telcser wishes to vote 'no'. Telcser 'no'. Ropp 'no'. Stuffle 'no'. Representative Birkinbine proceed with questions of the affirmative."

Birkinbine: "Representative Leon."

Speaker Flinn: "John Leon? In his seat. No, that's not him. I'm sorry. Representative Leon is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll. Representative Satterthwaite votes 'no'. Satterthwaite 'no'. Representative Birkinbine proceed."

Birkinbine: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Flinn: "McAuliffe, I don't see the Gentleman at his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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



Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Birkinbine: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Flinn: "Mulcahey? I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Birkinbine: "Representative Winchester."

Speaker Flinn: "Winchester's is back in the back there on your side."

Birkinbine: "That's all Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Give us the count, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 98 'aye' and 54 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1,2, and 3..? Sponsor? Who's the Sponsor? McClain? 1,2 and 3? House does concur in Senate Amendments 1,2 and 3 and the.. this Bill, having a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On ... Daniels 'aye'. Vote Daniels 'aye' on that last one. Van Dwyne 'aye'. We can't do that. We can't do. It's a verified. You can come down here and sign a slip and take a chance on that if you want. Make a motion. Okay. On page two under the heading of 'Senate Bills, Third Reading' appears Senate Bill 157. Read Senate Bill 157."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 157, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Barnes. Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 157 is the Bill that we usually have to carry the various appropriations for the various Commissions and agencies. This omnibus Bill now contains all of those agencies and a lot of appropriations that have been amended on to Senate Bill 157 here in the House also incorporating within them House Bill 2004. I would solicit the support of the



House: The bottom line on this Bill currently is 546 million, 639 thousand, 796. I would answer any questions relative to Senate Bill 157. And solicit the support of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you state your motion again? I'm sorry. I was busy here."

Barnes: "I.. the bottom line on this appropriation is 546 million, 637 thousand, 796. And I would solicit the support of the House for Senate Bill 157."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "How on earth does it get to 546 million dollars for a bunch of miscellaneous Commissions? You have the CTA in there too?"

Barnes: "There's no CTA in there. If you were here Representative Skinner, you voted for the various appropriations. One reason that it kicks up is there's 519 million in for corporate property tax replacement."

Skinner: "I voted for all of that?"

Barnes: "Yes, you did."

Skinner: "I must have blinked. May I ask you, is the Hospice Commission in here?"

Barnes: "Yes, it is."

Skinner: "How much is in there for that?"

Barnes: "Fifty thousand which passed both the House and the Senate."

Skinner: "Any may I ask what the Commission intends to spend that money on? Do you have any idea? They're going to Europe or to California or maybe to Tahiti?"

Barnes: "Well, Representative Skinner, I can't tell you since I'm merely the Sponsor of the Omnibus Bill. But this Bill, the substantive Bill, and the appropriation was heard in both Houses and passed upon. That is the reason for it being embodied in this Bill."

Skinner: "Yes, but it passed this House because we thought it was going to be for Representative Marovitz's vacation."



He has since informed me that he does not even expect to be appointed to the Commission. So it must be for someone else's vacation. I would just like to know who will be the beneficiary before I vote 'no'."

Barnes: "Well, Representative, that's one of the questions that I simply can't answer because I was not involved with that Bill at any stage. So I can merely tell you.. I can merely tell you that the Bill was acted on through the process both here in the House and across the rotunda in the Senate in an affirmative manner and that's the reason it is within this Bill."

Skinner: "Well, Representative Barnes, if you'll look around you'll see there's plenty of volunteers. You could name some perhaps and give some legislative history to the Speaker when he makes his appointment. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Could the Gentleman tell me how many separate appropriations are in this Bill that were defeated when they were brought separately before the Body?"

Barnes: "To the best of my knowledge, Representative, none."

Leinenweber: "What about The Year of the Child? Is there anything for that?"

Barnes: "I don't know. Everything that is within this Bill that I know of either/or passed the both Houses or passed the Senate upon their action. That's what's in this Bill. Now in terms of direct answers to your question, you said, how many are in here that failed both Houses? The answer is none."

Leinenweber: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, briefly on the Bill..."

Speaker Flinn: "Let me... Let me interrupt you first before you start on the Bill. Representative Van Duyne, for what purpose do you arise?"

Van Duyne: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to interrupt him. Before he goes any further, I just



want to point out to him that one of those appropriations is his."

Leinenweber: "Well, I was about ready to speak on behalf of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you should know. You weren't recognized to join in the debate, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "I'm sorry."

Leinenweber: "Not only is this a good Bill because it's going to send me to San Diego, but I fully expect to be appointed to the Ethnic Neighborhood Committee and I'm going to go and check every.. the homeland for all these ethnics to make sure they're living right. I also expect to be appointed to the Hospice Committee so I can go to Europe, Ireland, England, and all the places where they have hospices so that I can see what they're supposed to look like. So I fully expect to use this money very well and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "One moment. Before he yields to a question. Representative Collins for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Collins: "He'll never get by the border in Ireland."

Speaker Flinn: "With a name like that, I'll bet you're right. Representative Kosinski. "

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "The House in its wisdom put on a \$10.00 repayment to me for a parking fee. Was that removed by the Senate?"

Barnes: "Yes, it was."

Kosinski: "You leave me no recourse except to go through the Court of Claims."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it doesn't really matter whether the Senate passed something or not. There is money in here that this House has twice resoundingly defeated. It's called an appropriation for International Year of the Child. Now you're probably tired of hearing this voice talk about International Year of the Child, but you have joined me in opposing this on two separate occasions, once last December and then again last month. This task force that the Governor has appointed was supposed to be without funds. That was the promise he made when he appointed it. All of a sudden, he is proposing to put money in for International Year of the Child Task Force. Now what is the International Year of the Child Task Force anyway? It's a group of Illinois citizens that's cooperating with the National Commission on International Year of the Child which is headed by Mrs. Andrew Young and it is something that was begun by the United Nations in 1959. At that time, by the way, the United Nations issued a proclamation of rights of the child in connection with this and one of the rights of the child was the right to be born which was very nice. Unfortunately, however, in 1978 when the U.N. reissued the proclamation in preparation for giving us this wonderful year, the U.N. took out the right to be born. It was the only right that they took out. So now the United Nations wants us to talk about children, but don't talk about unborn children. We mustn't mess with the abortion issue in International Year of the Child. Well I think that if there were going to be any balance in this discussion, that there would have been concern for the unborn children as they are children. International Year of the Child is brought to us by those wonderful people who brought us



International Womens Year. And we all remember the wonders of International Womens Year. We remember what they did in Normal, Illinois. We remember what they did in Houston, Texas. A more radical conference could not be imagined in the United States of America. This might very well be what they envisioned for our children. I think that the American way is to have people concerned with problems, propose solutions to those problems from the grass roots up. Not to have the people buy something through their Government that was handed down to them by the United Nations. I have time thank you. I would urge you all please to defeat this Bill so that we can accomplish having the Sponsors of this Bill excise the 14 thousand dollars for International Year of the Child that has no business being in here after we have defeated it resoundingly on two separate occasions. In May we defeated it with more than 90 'no' votes. Stick with it those of you who voted 'no', then. Vote 'no' now. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ebbesen. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'aye's have it. And the Sponsor is recognized to close. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're all fully aware of what's in 157. I would urge the House for support for Senate Bill 157."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall the House... Senate Bill 157 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Chapman. One minute to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I remember what happened in Bloomington and I remember what happened



because I was there. And what happened was something that we can all be inspired by and can be proud of. And I'm voting against the John Birch society and I'm voting with Representative Eugene Barnes."

Speaker Flinn ; "Representative Dyer, to explain her vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on for the same reason. I was present at Bloomington and I was present in Houston and I am really tired of having the John Birch society, the Ku Klux Klan, and other groups and people who were not there defaming my good name. And I just wish they'd cut that out. It's irrelevant to this Bill. I think a 'yes' vote to this Bill is good and I am offended by the negative remarks of a previous speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Spoke in debate, I'm sorry Lady. State your point. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "It is quite obvious that I am being referred to as the John Birch society and the Ku Klux Klan..."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't think she called your name..."

Pullen: "Mr..."

Speaker Flinn: "Cut her off. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 101 voting 'aye' and 49 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 891."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 891, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Before we recognize Representative Ryan, we'll have a Committee announcement here. And while he's... Before he does that, Representative Stuffle found a glass case, eye glasses, on his desk. If anybody recognizes it, he can come up and claim it."



Representative Ryan. Wait a minute. Representative
 .. Ryan, hold on a minute. Jack O'Brien, the Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "There's a new Conference Committee History
 pending report now being distributed by the pages.

Date time 4:41 p.m."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlmen of the
 House. Senate Bill 891 is the ordinary and contingent
 operating expenses for the Department of Transportation.
 It contains 2 billion, 547 million, 705 thousand, 300
 dollars. I will be glad to attempt to answer any
 questions you may have. I might add.. It's 420 million,
 824 thousand dollars below the introduced level. And
 I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Kane,
 the Gentleman from Sangamon. Representative Campbell,
 the Gentleman from Vermilion."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
 the House, I've been waiting for about a year for
 this. I'm not going to oppose this transportation budget
 and the reason I'm not is because there are many, many
 dedicated people in the Department of Transportation and
 in the District Offices. But I do want to say to all
 of you that have been in the back room snickering with
 the Secretary, that the Secretary of this Department
 is the damndest bureaucratic liar that ever worked in
 State Government. And I want everybody in this House
 to know that. And I still am going to support this
 Department of Transportation budget and the reason
 I am is because of the dedicated people that have
 worked in that Department for many, many years. But
 certainly not because of him. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, refresh my memory, I seem to recall
 that there is some bond money in here and I believe it



takes 107 votes to pass. Is that correct?" Mr. Speaker?
 "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes. State your inquiry."

Bowman: "Well, will this take 107 votes?"

Speaker Flinn: "No. 89 votes."

Bowman: "Is there any bond money in here at all?"

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear you."

Bowman: "Is there any... Are there any bond authorizations
 in here at all?"

Speaker Flinn: "Would the Sponsor answer that? No bond authori-
 zations at all."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Giorgi. Zeke Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan, is there any money for new
 constructions in this DOT budget?"

Ryan: "Yes."

Giorgi: "How much?"

Ryan: "300... 300 million dollars."

Giorgi: "How much for FAP 412? That's been promised for
 the last ten years."

Ryan: "Pardon?"

Giorgi: "How much for FAP 412, the north-south highway?"

Ryan: "Is that highway 51 that runs through your District?"

Giorgi: "The highway 51 is the one that's been in existence
 since you Republicans were in charge. I'm talking
 about the new north-south highway, FAP 412."

Ryan: "I understand, Representative, the figure is somewhere
 around 15 million dollars."

Giorgi: "What part of the highway, George?"

Ryan: "The part that runs by your house, Zeke."

Giorgi: "No, I'm too far from the highway. 15 million?"

Ryan: "Rockford to LaSalle."

Giorgi: "Is that reappropriation or is that a new 15 million,
 George?"

Ryan: "New money."



Giorgi: "New money. Okay, George. I can give you a vote on this."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan yield for a question or two? What have we got in this package for the RTA?"

Ryan: "The amount that was in the original budget, 143 million dollars. There's no new funding here at all."

Huskey: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I would like to have a question answered from the Sponsor."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Borchers: "How much money is there on the new route 51 in Macon County up to Bloomington? How much is allocated for that?"

Ryan: "Would you repeat that Webber please?"

Borchers: "The money allocated in this Bill for north of Decatur to Bloomington; how much money is there in this Bill?"

Ryan: "There is only right-of-way money there, Webber. There's no construction money. It's only right-of-way money."

Borchers: "How much is that money that's allocated?"

Ryan: "It's.. It's about ten million dollars, I understand."

Borchers: "How much? I didn't hear."

Ryan: "Ten million."

Borchers: "Ten million."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, Representative Ry... Oh, Representative Jack Davis. Sorry I didn't see you. Jack Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Aside from the fact this contains everyone's pork which is good for them and I usually support pork in Committee and maybe not vote for this Bill on the floor, but all the transportation difficulties and divisions and proposals going on



in this House and across the rotunda in the cham. in the Senate, I just believe it would be the best course for this House to hold this Bill and either vote 'present' or vote 'no' until such time as the issues are clarified and until we know what this Bill is going to be used for ultimately. It is my contention that this Bill will be part of the transportation package that many of us in this House do not chose to support. And I would think at this point that all of those who have committed to the idea of equity for all areas of the state, in Chicago, in suburban Cook, collar counties and downstate that we who have opposed the proposed gubernatorial mayoral proposition have fought so hard to produce that equity in a counterproposal. I believe that this Bill should probably be held until those issues are clarified. So for those who support that position I would request you to vote 'present' or 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, to close."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In response to the previous speaker, all this Bill can do is reflect any new funding sources. So he's off base on anything that he might fear from this Bill. There's 111 million, 675 thousand, 100 dollars in pork projects in this Bill. And I tell you right now that if I don't get the needed votes, I will not put it on Postponed Consideration and the Bill will die. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 891 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative McClain is reconized to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentle-



men, I'm supporting this piece of legislation. I understand what Mr. Davis was saying and I agree with the philosophy, but my point is I think we ought to support this one. Otherwise they're just going to tack it on another Bill. It's going to be a Conference Committee. It's going to be tacked on another Bill, the Department of Aging, the Department of Public Aid, the Department of Children and Family Services. There are plenty of vehicles around. If you've got any projects in here or if you've been through the appropriation process, at least you know what's on this Bill. You've been part of the process. You've had your chance for Amendments whether it be for air cargo sites or roadways or whatever, you know what this is. You tag this one down and you hold it up or just tack it onto another appropriation. You know that sooner or later we're going to fund the Department of Transportation so I'd rather have it earmarked now so you and I can take a look at it rather than let them hide it on a different appropriation and we see it at 1:30 in the morning."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Matijevich: "Yes. No, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I guess I voted for every appropriation Bill this Session in contrast to last Session just to prove to the conservative union that you really don't hold off spending depending on how one votes because the Governor controls the budget and yes, they can tack on this budget to anything. But I do want to say that really this Bill isn't the one that's important as far as I'm concerned and we've got.. oh, just a little more than six hours when we may have a vehicle for transportation and I happen to know that there's some people on the floor of this House are just violent, just violent about the package that could develop. And



I can't believe that my Leadership and the Republican Leadership could let anything get away from this House that so many Members are violent about. I mean, in all my..."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you.. Have you got some more to say, John? I'll turn you back on."

Matijevich: "Well, I did have something to say because I really believe that the Leadership on both sides of the aisle ought to pay attention to the fact that whenever an issue has that much emotion about it, and I say, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that in all my times in the Legislature since the income tax, I've never seen so much emotion and I hope our Leadership realizes that's it and that we have enough time for every Member, whenever that package comes out, to vent their emotions so that we're all heard and so that no area of the state gets the shaft. I don't want to see that."

Speaker Flinn: "O'Brien. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the Chair in the next eight hours that you not violate the rules and that you operate the House in a proper fashion. No one should receive special treatment on any measure. And I think if we're going to conduct..."

Speaker Flinn: "Sorry about that. That part of Matijevich. I got your point. It was well taken."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewell, Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think I have had just about enough. I am going to at this time capitulate.. I'm going to buy a ticket on the train and see if I can get a seat somewhere. I'm going to vote 'aye' on everybody's bad Bills because no matter where they come from, they're coming back again and again



and no matter what happens, they're going to be on the Omnibus Bill. I'd like a seat on the train. And I'm confessing publically. I'm going to vote 'aye' on all these bad Bills. The war is over."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', and 36 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Pullen, for what purpose do you arise?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, it is true that in the rules a Member has the right to speak on a point of personal privilege if his or her name was used in debate, but that is not restricted to that in parliamentary procedure. If there is a reason, there is a valid reason for a point of personal privilege, nothing says it has to be only if your name is used in debate. I think it was rather obvious to most of the Members of this House that there were comments made by two individuals in this House who were attempting to suggest that I was representing in the things that I said here certain organizations. I am not a Member of either of those organizations and I do not speak for either of those organizations. I represent the voters of the 4th Legislative District. They elect me, not organizations. It may be very cute to practice guilt by association, but even though it would be very easy for me to do that, I will not because it would be, I suspect, just as inaccurate as those comments that were made about me and I appreciate your allowing me to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Back on page.. page 3 is House Bill.. Well 1759. Representative McGrew is recognized for a



motion."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2. The Amendme... The Bill as it left the House provided for the State of Illinois to pay for any rebuilding or reconstruction necessary to faulty construction. The Senate added an Amendment saying that it would be up to the Capital Development Board instead of a General Assembly to decide when reconstruction was necessary. The second Amendment says that nothing in this Bill should stop the junior colleges from continuing in suits for repayment. I would ask for concurrence in both Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to .. that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 1759. And on that motion, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Are you moving to concur? And what is.. I think you know my question. I'm concerned about rebuilding some buildings associated with the Illinois Eastern Community College as a result of some faulty construction at Robinson and I think one other building. Did these... any of these Amendments remove that funding?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "No, it did not. This is not the funding Bill. This is a substantive Bill mainly saying that the Capital Development Board shall pay 100% of the reconstruction instead of 75%."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 1759. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 voting 'aye' and 8 voting 'nay', and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby de-



clared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. On page 4 is Senate Bill 1053 and Representative Totten is recognized for a motion. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1053, I move to recede from House Amendment #1. What House Amendment #1 did, the Bill is a job tax credit Bill and the Senate amended it to include tax relief in the form of tax indexing. The House... We took off the Amendment in the House because we had a Bill at the passage stage in the Senate. That Bill has now been defeated. So the Senate nonconcurred in our attempt to remove tax indexing which was an indication that maybe they wanted it and now we are in the posture of giving the tax payers of this state some tax relief out of this Session for it's apparent that the only tax relief Bill that is going to go to the Governor's desk is the sales tax on food and drugs and that Bill is going to be vetoed. When we came down here from six months ago the main theme of the Session and the message that we got from the people was that we wanted...they wanted some tax relief. Well, if the Democrats continue their posture under the Majority Leader we're going to come out of here June 30th or July 1st with not one bit of tax relief. So what's before us now is our last chance to provide some tax relief. Now I can't guarantee to you that the Governor will sign this Bill because he hasn't looked favorably on legislation that may reach his desk. But this will at least give him an opportunity to consider some tax relief that is not of the magnitude that some.. of that which will be on his desk. Tax indexing simply takes the personal exemption of \$1,000 and will index it by the rate of inflation. Should the rate of inflation for the next fiscal year be 10% .. or



the next calendar year, then that exemption would go up to \$1100 and it would continually be indexed year after year. Now, in the last two years this House has approved this measure twice overwhelmingly. The Governor chose to veto the legislation last time. Maybe he got the message too and maybe by passing.. by receding from Amendment #1 and putting Senate Bill 1053 on his desk, the Governor will provide that tax relief that I know the Members of this side of the aisle want and by their votes in the past, I know the Members from the other side of the aisle want too. Now let me conclude by saying this, the Majority Leader was on the floor of this House the other night waving the words of the Thompson proposition at us and telling us that tax relief was an important measure and that spending and tax limits were an important measure. Well, now those spending and tax limits that the Democrats proposed have now been scuttled by them in the Senate so that there is only one proposal outside of this one that may go on the Governor's desk. If the Majority Leader and if all the Members in the House are really interested in providing some tax relief, then let's provide this measure, Senate Bill 153 (sic), which provides the job tax credits for minority groups in the city and in other areas of the State, a Bill that is well thought of and the tax indexing provision that I am.. I am moving to recede so that this stays on the Bill as one other measure that the Governor can chose from and I ask your support in receding from House Amendment #1."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House recede from Amendment #1 on the Senate Bill 1053 and on that motion, Representative Madigan, is recognized."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion. I certainly do not question his motives in offering these



two proposals. However, I suggest to you, especially those of you on the Democratic side of the aisle, that this would simply confuse the issue of tax relief in this state. This General Assembly already has sent to the Governor the best form of tax relief. We have provided the sales tax on food and medicine shall be removed. There can be no fairer tax relief than that elimination of the sales tax on food and medicine which is already gone to the Governor. For us at this time to also send these two measures which are tax relief, but which are minor in comparison the relief that we have already passed on to the Governor would simply confuse the issue. I suggest to you that our record ought to be clean. It ought to be clear. It's already been written. It's on the Governor's desk and I would recommend a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ewing."

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

I am indeed surprised at the last speech of the Majority Leader. He knows very well that the tax relief measure on the Governor's desk can't be signed. How can he sign it and put out his transportation package? Now we all We didn't get the opportunity the other night when that was rammed through to say that the tax relief, when we take the sales tax off, is for the rich. It helps those with the most money. This Bill is for the poor people. And it shows when the Republicans get on there that we are for the little man. Because the more exemptions you have, the more tax relief you're going to get, not the more money you have, the more tax relief you're going to get. I am indeed surprised at his position on this good tax relief measure. And I suggest that the Republicans get on it wholeheartedly and send it down to our Governor."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Bullock."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'

All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

The 'aye's have it. And the Sponsor is recognized to close. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The issue of tax indexing has not been a partisan issue. There have been Members on the other side of the aisle who have worked together with those of us who feel that tax indexing ought to be an adjustment to the Illinois income tax. Without indexing the Illinois income tax we have put ourselves in the position of being partners in inflation rather than foes of inflation. Because as that tax exemption erodes every year, we have reaped the harvest of the accumulated benefits and we have increased taxes to our tax payers without ever having legislated a tax increase. Tax indexing corrects that inequity. It positions us as foes of inflation. It restores equity to our tax system. It restores justice to our tax system and it protects those who are hurt most by inflation and insidious tax that has captured our tax dollars at a very unequal way. And I ask your support of the motion to recede from Amendment #1 so that we can provide some real relief."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1053. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no'. The t.v. lights are off during the explanation of votes. Representative Vinson, one minute to explain your vote. Timer's on."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It won't take that long. I just want to appeal to everybody in this chamber who



has any sense of decency to give this committed and dedicated Sponsor of tax relief a chance to pass his Bill. He's got a right to do that. He's worked harder for it than anybody else in this chamber. And he ought to have a right to put his Bill on the Governor's desk. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lainenwber."

Leinenweber: "I had a question I wanted to ask the Sponsor in debate. Perhaps he could give me an answer in his explanation of vote because his answer may very well depend on how I vote on his Bill. I'm entitled to seven exemptions. How much tax relief will I get?"

Speaker Flinn: "Remember that, Representative Totten, when you get your turn. Representative Birkinbine, one minute to explain your vote."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I found the comments by the Majority Leader interesting in the extreme. To say that this would confuse the issue is a real slap in the face at senior citizens and people who are on fixed incomes because the analogy is the same. We're talking about a thousand dollar deduction that each and every year gets eroded by inflation. You tell me that those people don't understand what inflation does to a fixed income. Tell me that they don't understand what inflation does to a flat \$1,000 grant. This would index it so that when inflation goes higher, that \$1,000 grant increases. And to see all these people who just the other day professed to be proponents of tax relief not only for the elderly and the youth, but everybody, to see them voting against this issue because it confuses the issue is a real joke."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Robbins, to explain his vote. One minute, the timer's on."

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



this is real tax relief. This is something that I believe that the Governor will sign. I think we should go home and say we have at least passed one Bill that gives some tax relief and the Governor will approve of. Now if you want to cut the working man off and the other people off, why just go ahead and vote red and let that be on your conscience cause you know how hard it is to try to get by and I really think that Leinenweber with his seven exemptions really needs this tax relief."

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

Schuneman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, tax indexing is an idea whose time has come. We have lived through several years of extreme inflation in this country and during that time when tax exemptions are set at a stipulated amount in the law one of the greatest beneficiaries of inflation is government. Because government continually gets more money in tax revenue as long as it does not allow an increase in tax exemptions. I think that we've had a number of tax relief Bills in this House this Session, many of which are phony. This is one of the real tax relief measures that will continue to work for the benefit of the consumer years into the future and I certainly urge concurrence and adoption of the Gentleman's motion."

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

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I supported this Sponsor's measure for tax indexing last year. We sent that to the Governor's desk and what happened? The Governor vetoed it because he did not want to give this kind of tax relief at that time."



We've decided this time to send him a different kind of tax relief and see if he likes that any better. I think you're being hypocritical to say now that we will be showing the people that we don't want tax indexing. We showed the people that we wanted it and it got vetoed. Vote 'no'."

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

Schoeberlien: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that you are a Co-Sponsor of if you vote green cause this is a Bill where the Roll Call will be shown by the papers tomorrow and during the weeks ahead. And I hope many of you get on here to make it 100 so you've got that many Co-Sponsors."

Speaker Flinn: "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... Representative Borchers, didn't I recognize you during the debate and I didn't while..." Go ahead and explain your vote."

Borchers: "My first explanation would be, for heaven's sake, begin to look over on this side cause I'm up against a wall. That shouldn't be the reason... Now.. Okay. I just wanted to point out in relation to the last speaker that she said vote 'no' because the Governor vetoed it last year. Well let's give him a chance to veto it again by voting 'yes'. That was kind of a peculiar argument and negative argument in the first place."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Representative Borchers, it is rather difficult to keep up with all the lights and you're watching them so I.. I'm sorry. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, could I have a poll of the absentees,



please."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Catania. Christensen. Gaines. Huff. Kane. Keane. McGrew. Molloy. Preston. Reilly. Rigney. Schisler. Schlickman. VonBoeckman. and Sam Wolf."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Keane wishes to vote 'no'. Preston 'no'. Give me the count. On this question there are 87 'aye's and 41 'no's and this Bill did not receive the Constitutional Majority and is hereby declared lost. Representative Totten, for what purpose do you arise?"

Totten: "We had a Member seeking recognition here. I was yelling and you didn't recognize me."

Speaker Flinn: "I already declared it lost..."

Totten: "I... Mr. Speaker, you have operated curteously. I had my light on seeking recognition. The Member indicated to me he wanted to vote on the issue."

Speaker Flinn: "House Bill 2569 is next up."



Speaker Flinn: "2569, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2569. Senate Amendments 3, 13 and 14."

Speaker Flinn: "The T.V. lights are back on. Representative McPike. House Bill 2569. It's on page 4 under Concurrence...Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Lechowicz in the chair."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Last night House Bill 2569 failed to pass out of this House and failed to reach the Governor's desk by 2 votes. We've been talking about the burden placed on Illinois business under this tax, which we believe is no different than the burden placed on Illinois business under the now Unconstitutional...or the now no longer existent Corporate Personal Property Tax. This should not be a partisan issue. I said last night, we have a Constitutional obligation to return to the local units of government, school districts, park districts, the various local units of government have relied on this income in the past ... we have an obligation to return that income to them under our Constitution. There are two proposals left at this late date. The Governor is asking for a 2.5 rate retro-active to January 1st. That will increase the tax on Illinois' business 206 million dollars more in Fiscal...in Calendar Year '79. House Bill 2569 calls for a raise of 2.85 beginning July 1. Between the Governor and this we are one-third of one percentage point off. In all the negotiations the Governor and his staff have crept closer and closer to our proposal. They now admit that a rate of 2.5 effective July 1 cannot bring in sufficient revenue. They now admit



that the figures that we have been using all along are accurate as far as possible. They now admit that the only way to raise enough money at their rates is to make it retro-active to the beginning of the year and slap business with an additional six months of income liability this year. Perhaps business will break even five years down the road under the two plans. I think that ours has been the only sensible proposal before us. The only one that has addressed all the issues. An equitable tax on business, a fair replacement mandated by the Constitution, a decent return to local units of government for what they have due them. We have waited 9 years for this tax to be replaced. We are now in the last hours of the last day of this Session. We cannot leave Springfield without this. This General Assembly will be judged in part, if not in whole, by the tax Bill that we put on the Governor's desk to replace the Corporate Tax. I have personally been disgusted and shocked at what the corporations have done to defeat this Bill. Specifically, Caterpillar Corporation. They not only were against the 2.85 rate, they're against the 2.5 rate, they're against the 2.0 rate that was suggested months ago by the Governor. They and many other businesses in this state would be very happy if we never do anything, if we leave here without ever replacing that 500 plus million dollar tax bill that they owe.... Years ago, some Members of this General Assembly were indicted for dealing with the trucking industries. If any industry approached a Member of this floor with the same type of propositions that we've had thrown at us in the Governor's Office and in conversations with some of the corporate executives, the Members



of this General Assembly would be before a Grand Jury. I think their behavior has been criminal. They don't want a solution to the problem, they want us to go home without fulfilling our obligations without rendering the service that is necessary to our local schools and local units of government. If this doesn't pass, if it does go to a Conference Committee, I guarantee that there will be no special treatment for any one individual corporation. If there are any compromises at all those compromises will not be in this tax package. Every corporation in this state, every partnership should be treated the same. You pay tax on the income you make. That is the most fair and equitable treatment we can offer to anyone. If you make no income you pay no tax. But if you make 550 million dollars in a state where you claim the business climate is bad, then we're going to require that the tax you pay is at the same rate as the tax that the smallest business in the state pays. There will be no special treatments delivered from this House floor or from Springfield for any corporation. Thus said, I think that we know that this package is the best package that we could deliver to all concerned in Illinois. I ask you now to examine your conscience, to fulfill the obligation that you're sent here to fulfill, to live up to our Constitution to vote to replace this tax.

Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendments #3, 13 and 14 to House Bill 2569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing. Excuse me, the Clerk...the announcement of the Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is now being distributed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am indeed glad that we have returned to this important measure. It is a matter which must be addressed by this General Assembly and it must be addressed by this General Assembly before the end of this day. It is not a partisan matter. All of us who looked at the last Roll Call saw that there were Democrats and there were Republicans who opposed the measure which the Sponsor proposes we concur in here today. We have tried to compromise. We don't want to go away and do nothing because all of us have many units of local government, all of us have schools which must be funded, we know the need for this type of legislation. There are three things that we feel, on this side of the aisle and throughout this General Assembly I think must be done, the lost revenues must be replaced for local governments. We must fulfill our mandate in the Constitution this year and third, we must send to the State of Illinois, to the United States and to businesses in the state and throughout the country, the message that we know that they are welcome here, that we want them to stay. Now we talk about the figures in House Bill 2569 and the Sponsor would have you believe that those that we propose are incorrect and can't be substantiated, when in fact just the opposite is true. It is their figures that cannot be substantiated. He talks about our wanting to go back to January 1st to assess this tax. This is done all the time. It was done with the Illinois Income Tax, it's done at the federal level, there's nothing unconstitutional about it. If we don't tax back to January 1 then



there will be at least 7 or 8 months of this year in which there will be no replacement tax. And you...the Sponsor would have us believe that business is getting such a big break here. Well if we take their tax measure and go from July or August there will be a tremendous amount of additional tax collected. By going back, the extra tax which we collect in 1979, it will only take...will have the lower rate to go on forever or at least until this General Assembly changes it again. That's the important thing. What rate are we going to tax business at? The Governor's proposal will raise more money at a lower rate. And that may sound very strange but it can be done on a cash flow basis...raise more money for local governments and distribute that money than can be done under the Democratic proposal. It will replace the money when needed and it will keep our tax rate on business and industry sound. It will help us from continuing to deteriorate the business climate that is eroding in this state so badly. I would ask that we nonconcur, that we accept the Governor's promise at his word that he will veto this measure and will be back here later this summer. It wasn't 15 minutes ago that I talked to him and he reiterated that promise. It's 2.5, 1.5 for partnerships and .75 for utilities. That's fair, it will work, it will take us out of this problem and I cannot believe that the Sponsor of this Bill doesn't realize this and I hope that we will put down this last futile effort to stop business with an extra tax, adopt the reasonable program and go home. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going



to be brief, I'm going to say just a few things but I was very glad to hear that Representative McPike said this was a bipartisan obligation. I buy that. I think it is bipartisan. I think we have an obligation as laid out in the Constitution of Illinois to replace this tax with a replacement tax on certain entities. I'm in accordance with that. I am opposed to concurrence on 14, basically because it is not the way to go. I would like very much to see this go to a Conference Committee. And yes, I will agree with Mr. McPike, that this has got to be a fair tax on all corporations, partnerships, what have you. It's got to be a fair tax, it is not that now. The only choice we have is to resent the arm twisting that's gone on for the last 6 months, and yes, very severely in the last week and 2 days. Arm twisting is part of the process. It's failed. This isn't a suitable compromise. I would just recommend to my colleagues on this side of the aisle to hang fast, don't be bullied into changing your position. In fact, maybe more of you ought to join me in making this a true bipartisan move. Send it to a Conference Committee so we can come up with a truly good replacement corporate tax Bill so that then we could support it and it could go to the Governor's desk for his signature. I would say, do not concur in Senate Amendment #14."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to let you know that if this gets 89 votes I'd like to verify it. I'd like you to know that now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're entitled to that, Sir. The Gentleman from Colas, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to point out



and to note as a Democrat that the Democrats put together this package. We take full responsibility for this package. The Democratic Task Force in which I served and many people in this House much wiser than I and later Democrats in the Senate put this program together. Even the Republican leaning Chicago Tribune, even prior to the Amendment in the Senate which reduced the revenue impact of this measure, endorsed it and praised our efforts. And that is no small effort or achievement for Democrats. One thing that has failed to be repeated if even stated on this floor is this, some have claimed we're giving the taxing districts too much. I don't believe that's the case. What they've failed to point out is simply this, that there will be a substantial revenue loss even with the passage of this Bill in terms of local taxing districts because we're shifting to state support with the loss of the local property tax revenue we're talking about here. Because there will be lost millions of dollars in federal revenue sharing because of a lost local tax effort. We pointed out, but we ought to point out again, that the real liabilities that would have been there under the old tax would not have been 520 million dollars but rather closer to some sum in excess of 800 million dollars. It should be pointed out again that the home owner may well pick up the burden if it's not picked up here. And who's better able to pick it up? Those who make the 535 million dollar profit or those who work day to day to pay for their own homes or who rent? Or the Senior Citizens and so forth, who may well pick it up? I've heard the argument on the other side that we should have supported the last measure. We can't be responsible in the main if we



support all efforts to cut spending and taxes...We can support some and not others, we must be responsible in doing so. I can't understand why there are so many sets of figures floating about this House. Or how many sets you've got to use to attempt to justify various programs that would gut this issue and gut this Bill. I, for one, am proud to stand here as a Democrat and say that I'm going to vote 'aye' for the efforts of the task force and the efforts of the people who have worked so hard to put this together. That task force, I believe, stands on the side of the homeowners, the little people in this state and not the giant corporations. And if the Democratic Party does nothing else in this House or the Senate this Session that's successful, this should be. The Democratic Party has stood for those little people and they stand there now. I think we should take our chances with the Governor. I remember when he ran against Michael Howlett. One of the big issues was that Michael Howlett worked for a giant steel corporation as a consultant. And Governor Thompson ran around this state saying he wasn't in bed with the giant corporations. But I say to you, if he's not we'll find out when we put this on his desk. The easy and the simple thing to do would be vote 'no' on this measure because all the giant corporations...and if you look down the lobbying list I think you'll find 27 registered lobbyists for Caterpillar Tractor alone and at least that many more for the rest. They would love a 'no' vote. They understand a 'no' vote. They will be at your doorstep on Monday, if not tomorrow. The little people may not understand a 'yes' vote. They may not understand it because they didn't have, at least up front, the same benefits



to see that Caterpillar might enjoy in your opposition. But to be responsible, to be fair, to live up to our commitments and our efforts, as a Democrat, as I stand here I can do nothing more or less than cast a vote in concurrence and support of Representative McPike and the efforts of the Democratic Party. This is a Democratic Bill and I hope there are enlightened Republicans again tonight who will stand up in support of this effort. It is an effort put together by well meaning men and women. It is not an effort to rape anyone, whether he be a local taxpayer or a giant corporation. And I reiterate in finishing, we started from a point where some said, 'Use the collection base, that's the real liability.' We didn't do that. Then we went to a position where some said, 'Let's go on the middle ground.' And that would have meant another 100 million dollars or more liabilities for these corporations and the other entities taxed here. We didn't do that. Indeed, we sent a Bill out of here, as I said, supported even by the Tribune, by the Sun Times and by other people who have looked at this issue on all sides. We sent it to the Senate and we reduced it even more and we built in additional tax breaks. This is a good proposal. Let the Governor come down where he will but let him come down and let him come down either on the side of most people, on the side of the many or on the side of the few. I urge and 'aye' vote and do so proudly as a Democrat."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Spekaer, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've already hammered the nails in the coffin and we are just about to sound a death knell for small business in Illinois. If this Bill



passes we are the...not we, the Democrat Party will have voted out 2 tax increases in the past 3 days on small business. If you're truly interested in the economy of this state, if you're truly interested in creating new jobs in this state and in saving the jobs we have, then you'll vote against this concurrence and put this Bill in a Conference Committee where it can be negotiated and an equitable agreement can be arrived at. This is important to the business climate of Illinois and it's important to the economy of Illinois. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard it all before. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'. Opposed... The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, to close."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think everything has been said. I think it's time that we earn our salary and face up to the responsibility that we've been given as Legislators. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 3, 13 and 14 to House Bill 2569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Membership kindly correct their Calendars? We're moving to concur with Senate Amendments 3, 13 and 14 on House Bill 2569. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Democratic Party



in the State of Illinois has admitted that: this is their tax plan. You talk about the Caterpillar Corporation, you're losing 55 thousand jobs. Those are little people jobs to the State of Indiana because they have to leave..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me...excuse me, Mr. Simms. The t.v. camera lights are not permitted while the Membership is explaining their vote."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, that's losing 55 thousand jobs in the State of Illinois. You want to know why Caterpillar's leaving? Because under the Democrats tax proposal they're going to have to pay 5 times more tax for this type of thing in Illinois. Let's look at Workmen's Compensation, 38 percent more Illinois has to pay than Ohio, 83 percent more than Wisconsin and 144 percent more than Iowa. No wonder you're making Illinois an economic desert and the Democratic Party can take the responsibility."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, last night I was one of the first ones to cast a vote on this particular Bill. There's been a few rumblings and allegations that I made some kind of deal. When I make a deal I'll make it up front and you'll know about it. I stabbed no one in the back and I'll go to the chest. I voted 'aye' last night and I'll vote 'aye' tonight and I resent the rumbling, particularly by some of the people who have cut the most and the dirtiest deals in this Assembly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Simms was concerned because some businesses will be paying a higher tax under the new tax than they did under the



old. Of course, the question about equity in the tax was precisely the reason the Constitution mandated that we dispose of the Corporate Personal Property Tax, it fell unevenly, unfairly upon businesses in this state. The Constitution mandates us to replace the revenues lost by the Corporate Personal Property Tax and it mandates us to get the new tax to put the burden of the new tax on precisely those classes which paid the Corporate Personal Property Tax, corporations, trusts and partnerships. That's precisely what we did in House Bill 2569, we distributed that burden in a new Income Tax, a fairer tax, a more equitable tax than the old tax was. That's what the voters of the State of Illinois asked us to do in the Constitution of 1970, it is what we have done. Some corporations, some businesses will pay close to the same amount of dollars they did in the past. We had...we made a decision to go with an invested capital tax with public utilities. Public utilities did bear a large share of the burden under the old tax. But the issue whether or not a particular company is going to pay more taxes under the new... under the new form of taxation than they did under the old is hardly relevant to the issue that's before us today. Our mandate was to put the burden of the new tax on those same classes that paid the old. That we have done. Our mandate was to create a fairer, more equitable tax, that we truly have done. I urge more green lights."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to correct the thing, that according to my recollection it was Dan Walker that set up Mike



Howlett on the steel business but he may have forgotten that. There's one thing that bothers me a great deal and that's when the Gentleman from Madison suggests that the Executives to Caterpillar Tractor Company have committed an illegal act. Now if he knows that there's anything similar to what went on with the trucking industry and the Legislators in this hall then it's his duty to go to the State's Attorney, not just make a big pronouncement on the floor. That's an obligation he has, as well as any other citizen. And I would challenge him now, if he knows anything that's gone on illegally here in the form of bribery or anything else, you will report that, don't just be blasting off on the floor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, an example of the myths and fog and double talk that's coming from the other side of the aisle, I listened to one of them say 'You can get more money at a lower rate.' Well if you can believe that then you can believe all of the other things that's being said about this Bill and I'd urge more green lights."

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

Skinner: "I'm waiting for somebody over there on the other side of the aisle to tell all those little people how much that great giant steel company, U.S. Steel, is going to pay under your little Bill here. Is it true it's not going to pay a dime and you're letting them off the hook? And you go to the people and you're going to say that with a straight face? How much are the railroads going to pay? They hardly pay any taxes now. They going to pay any



taxes at all under your Bill? Do you think that's fair? I understand some of the big banks don't make much money because of the tax laws in Congress. Are they going to pay any money under your Bill? Well I think the answer is 'no'. What you haven't told the people is even if the company is a huge company and is able to evade taxes through the federal loopholes, they're not going to pay any taxes to the State of Illinois to replace the large amounts of Corporate Personal Property Tax they've been paying. Now tell them that. All the truth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I drive through the streets of Springfield I used to see Sangamo Electric. Drive down 11th Street and see all the empty factories and the small businesses and think of the things that we've done to the small businesses in this state. There used to be Wilson and Company, Armour and Company, Swift and Company and you can go down and name hundreds of others. They used to be. They're not here no more and there's going to be a lot less here that we can talk about. And are you going to be able to fulfill those jobs with patronage for those people that are all going to be out of work? Think very seriously. This is a very, very serious Bill. You're putting the absolutely death knell to the business people, both small and large. You're killing the employees, the small employees because they'll no longer have jobs. Think of it, think very seriously about it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

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



think that this is a very, very bad way to try to bilk the people. Force the companies out of Illinois and you will find out that the way to run the government will be taxing the homeowner more than what you realize. You lose the jobs, you lose the income and you lose the people."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief. If they make no money, they pay no tax."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I only have two very brief things to say. A lot of you seem to be talking, not from your own knowledge, but what others have told you. All I can say is, I saw Sangamo Electric leave here to go to a state they said had a better business climate and that meant 900 of my friends and neighbors are out of jobs. And finally, I want to say to one of the former speakers, he's not going to have to worry about the lobbyists next time. They won't be here, they'll be in Kansas."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. J. Wolf, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, unfortunately a lot of the people who have spoken on both sides of the aisle have referred to a large tractor company. I'm not too concerned about the large corporations, they have operations in many states and they can transfer their operations to other states so they don't pay the taxes in Illinois. But of the possibly 15 or 20 thousand corporations registered in this state the vast majority are small corporations, including the 'ma and pa' operations, the corner



drug store and others. And these are the ones that are going to be hurt the most by this tax. We always think of corporations as being large but just remember that most of the corporations in this state and elsewhere are very small operations, including those that are partnerships."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the last speech was nonsense. The retailers, large and small, of this state are paying a large personal property tax and want the replacement tax. The Governor has already agreed to a tax that's only a few mills below this tax. In negotiations he agreed even to go higher. The income tax is not why people are leaving the state. They've left the state already without the replacement tax. With the replacement tax we'll have a way of helping local government. If we don't pass this Bill the real estate taxpayer, including the homeowner, will make up the loss of revenue for schools and local government. The difference between 2.50 and 2.85 is so miniscule no one's going to leave the state. And the Governor... negotiations has indicated he'd agree to a 2.75. So we're talking between 2.75 and 2.85. We went below 3 percent at his request. He's still against it. He's showboating only. This is a good Bill, we should pass it because if we don't the real estate taxpayer, including the homeowner, will make up the loss of local revenue and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

The timer is on."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. What's being proposed here, it seems to me, are new economic shoes for the State of Illinois. The trouble is these economic



shoes are too big. They don't fit. And if we buy them we're going to find they cause blisters on the feet of Illinois' business and more and more Illinois' business is going to continue to hobble out of this state into neighboring states. I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris. The timer is on."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Each one of us in this House on both sides of the aisle know that the Constitution of 1970 mandates this type of legislation. If you're for good schools, if you're for good county government, good municipalities, you will vote for this legislation. If you don't like your good schools, if you don't like the good municipal government you have, if you don't like the good county government, vote against it. If you want good government, vote for it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to remind the Members of this House that truly we are not very far apart on the amount of money that has to be raised. Really, the only question is the raise and the structuring of the...the enactment date. And I think that we have done a very responsible thing by moving down from 3.0 to 2.85 and making other adjustments so that the total amount of money to be raised in the first year is very close to the amount that would be raised in the way we sent it over to the Senate. What I think I would like to further remind you of is that a point made by Representative Pierce, I hope all of you heard it."



that if we don't raise this money...if we don't raise the money it will be shifted off onto the real estate taxpayer because the money has got to be collected to keep our local governments operating. Now, at that there will be some school districts who are at their taxing limits and those school districts will not be able to raise their tax rates and at the same time they will have their tax base taken away from them. Now I don't think that any one of us wants to be a party to theft, theft, Ladies and Gentlemen, from our schools. So I think it behooves us to approve this adjustment, it is a fair and responsible one, and send it to the Governor's desk for his signature. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've heard a lot of rhetoric here about good government, good schools and so on. If we're going to pass this kind of a Corporate Property Tax we're not going to have any business and industry in the State of Illinois. When you don't have any business and industry in the State of Illinois you don't have any government. When you don't have any government you don't have any funding mechanism for the schools and everything else. I think we're on the road again...and I know this word's been used a lot, fiscal irresponsibility and I think it's still another ploy on the other side of the aisle to get as much P.R. as they can because they know they've got serious, serious, serious trouble in getting re-elected next year. They've run the business climate in the State of Illinois. This is just another effort



to continue doing it. And they ought to know because they started out five years ago with 101 on that side of the aisle and now they're down to 89. That should be a good example."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yeah, we're through...just put the t.v. cameras back on, we're through explaining the votes. Have all voted a wish? The Clerk will take the... For what purpose do you seek recognition? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 'aye', 84 'no', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Catania."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Catania, 'aye'. Oh, I'm sorry, that's what the Clerk said."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines. McAuliffe. Molloy. Schlickman. Stearney. Van Duyne. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take Mrs... The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted recognition, I would like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne. Kindly record Mr. Van Duyne as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe. Kindly record him as 'no'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

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

Dunn: "Please leave me on 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Von Boeckman: "If I might have a few minutes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Von Boeckman: "To express some feelings that I have been having for the last couple of days. I just want you to know that Caterpillar Tractor Company is in my district. I have two large plants. I've really lost the words to say how I personally feel. I feel state government has to go on, local government, our schools. I've been in politics for some twenty odd years and I think this is one of the trying moments of my day, I'd say. I feel we have to go on and do the things necessary. I held off my vote yesterday hoping that we could solve this problem. However, I feel Caterpillar is going to have to accept the 'brunt' of the blow on this so, Mr. Speaker, I...I really feel this will hurt me in my district for voting 'yes' because I'm the only one in the 45th, the 46th district that will be voting for this measure. However, I will take the responsibility on my shoulders and I will vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Von Boeckman as 'aye'." The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, are you seeking recognition?"

Schraeder: "No, I don't want recognition, I voted 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your light was on, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "I have been...I have been..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly give the Gentleman your attention."

Gaines: "...on both sides of this issue in the past. The first time this was up I voted for it. Last night I didn't. And after consulting with my district mate



here, and his mail is the same as mine, the only issue that we've gotten any mail on this year has been this issue. I've got a stack this high and the first time this vote came up I had it on my desk with me. And the leaders on both sides have talked to me and they're both the same...that in my district. And my final decision is based on my district. All other considerations were equal and the only thing that gave me the opportunity was the fact that my closest district mate here, Ray Ewell, is telling me the same thing that I got in my mail. The people of the 29th Legislative District are working people. The people of the 29th Legislative District want more money for the schools. I happen to be President of my local school Council, I'm past President of my district school council. And the one issue that's important above all other issues in my district is money for schools. And right now, when this Bill went over to the Senate it got cut. If it goes back again it will get cut again and I cannot take a chance on having this Bill getting cut. I want the Bill that's going to have the most money for Chicago schools and that's why I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 89 'aye', 85 'no' and I believe Mr. Telcser requested a verification. Does the Gentleman still persist? Mr. Telcser. The Gentleman persists in the verification. Our t.v. lights are off. Would the Membership kindly be in your own seats? A verification has been requested. Will all unauthorized personnel remove themselves? Would the Membership kindly be in your own seats? Would all the staff go to the back of the chamber, please? The Clerk will proceed to verify the



"affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijeovich. Mautino. McClain. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duynes. Vitek. Von Boeckman. White. Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Telcser, do you have any challenges of the affirmative vote?"

Telcser: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty. Mr. Beatty. He's here."

Telcser: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bradley is here. Mr. Christensen requests to be verified. Leave."

Telcser: "Representative Bowman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bowman is here."

Telcser: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Brummer is here."

Telcser: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Farley is here."

Telcser: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Dawson is here."

Telcser: "Representative Mulcahey."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mulcahey is here."

Telcser: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Steczo is here."

Telcser: "Representative Yourell."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell is here."

Telcser: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Darrow is here."

Telcser: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kosinski is here."

Telcser: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McClain is here."

Telcser: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Sharp is here."

Telcser: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 89 'aye', 85 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #3, 13 and 14 on House Bill 2569. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike."

McPike: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which we concurred...by which the House concurred in Amendments 3, 13 and 14 to 2569."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I move that that motion lie upon the table."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that motion lie upon the table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', opposed... The motion carries. House Bill... The Gentleman... Pardon me? The t.v. requests the lights be turned on. The t.v. request is granted."



The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Tuerk: "Well, on Supplemental Calendar #1 there's a motion filed under my name. It calls for discharging Executive Committee on House Joint Resolution CA #25 to advance that to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. I move for that motion, Mr. Speaker. What that motion is... Eight years ago in this chamber I introduced a Constitutional Amendment which would call for single Member Districts and the elimination of cumulative voting...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Tuerk? Mr. Tuerk? We'll try to get back to you. We're in the process of trying to clean up the Calendar. It was just distributed on 135. We're in the process of concurrences and we'll call on House Bill 2766. Mr. Tuerk? We'll try to get back to you today.."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you won't recongize me for the motion, I would suspend the appropriate rule to go to this Order of business and I would ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2766."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2766..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill was already called, Sir, before you were recognized. Yes, it was. Out of the record. I don't know. Mr. Ryan, did you request a conference? Mr. Ryan? Oh. Another minute? Okay. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the Bills with the following title; Senate Bill 578 which Amendments are as follows, House Amendments



#1,2,3,5 and 8. Action taken by the Senate June 30th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would request a Republican conference for about 30 minutes in 118."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman requests a Republican conference in room 118 for approximately 30 minutes Mr. Greiman?"

Greiman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I request a Democratic conference in Room 114 for the same period of time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Democrats will be in room 114. Republicans in room 118. The House will stand in recess till the hour of 7:30..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to welcome all our visitors from Joliet up in the Speaker's gallery, especially Mrs. June. Hello. By the way, I saw your wreath today out by the statue of Senator Dirksen and I noticed that small inscription. Welcome to Springfield."

Speaker Redmond: "House will be in order. Please, the Members please be in their seats. On the Order of Conference... Wait a minute. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution to wit; House Joint Resolution #46, concurred in by the Senate June 30, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee reports on page five. House Bill 112. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 112 is the Bill that has to do with the .. amending the Divorce Act with respect to the bifurcated



trials. As House Bill 112 went out of the House it allowed the parties, the husband and wife, to waive the 48 hour waiting period in the bifurcated trial provision. In the Senate they added an Amendment to let the Judge also waive this. When that came back for concurrence, Representative Brummer and a number of others didn't like that so we went to conference and what we agreed upon in conference is language that says in very limited instances, that both the parties and the Judge could waive the bifurcated trial so that the parties could settle the whole matter at one time. The language is that in cases where the grounds are uncontested and proved as in cases of default. The trial on all other remaining issues shall proceed immediately if so ordered by the court or if the parties so stipulate. I believe that this is a responsible resolution of the problem. I would urge adoption of the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 112."

Speaker Redmond: "You move to.. that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report? Is that correct?"

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's motion? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that we have a number of very burning issues in front of you right now including the latest Thompson-Byrne three plan. But we have a very, very important Bill before you, House Bill 112, that I would ask your indulgence for a moment. If you look at the Conference Committee Report, corrected report, on House Bill 112 you'll notice that I didn't sign the report. And the reason is because if you read the report it'll explain my objections to you. Please read the report and if you have trouble understanding it, then you wouldn't have signed it either. Because



it says as follows and I'll read it to you and if you can explain it to me in understandable language, then I'll come over and sign the report so that we can have this agreed to. It says as follows; 'In cases where the grounds are uncontested and proved in cases of default, the trial on all other remaining issues shall proceed immediately if so ordered by the court or if the parties so stipulate, issuance on the pleadings notwithstanding.' Now, precisely what does that mean? Frankly, I think it sounds like a group of lawyers got together and tried to describe an orange and came up with language that is the most confusing language that I can understand. I think you ought to take this report, throw it out, send it back to a second Conference Committee. The Sponsor is doing his best to get it in common language, bring it back to us in sensible, common, understandable language, in plain English so we don't have any problems with the court understanding what's being said."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would answer a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was your question?"

Ewing: "I have a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewing: "Representative Deuster..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Ewing: "Under current law isn't the 48 hour period waived in practice?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, there's so much noise here I couldn't even hear the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. Your observation is absolutely correct."

Ewing: "Representative Deuster, under common practice under our new Dissolutionment Act, aren't many cases the 48



hour period waived now?"

Deuster: "No. The problem is that the 48 hours is mandatory at least that's the way it's construed by the Judges in my circuit and everywhere that I know of and the basic Bill as it went out was to allow the parties to waive that. The law as it is right now is whether the parties agree or not, there's got to be the 48 hours and many times they don't want to come back to court a week later or a couple of months later. "

Ewing: "This is a 48 hour period between the trial of the issue of whether there should be a dissolutionment in the property and child support and this type of thing?"

Deuster: "That... That's right. Under present law if they go in... Representative Ewing, if they go in and have a trial on the grounds and that's contested, then they have to come back to court 48 hours later at some later time. House Bill 112 as it went out of the House, said that the parties could waive that. Now Judge Fleck has a serious problem in Cook County and as a result of that the Senate added an Amendment to allow the Judge to also waive that. Representative Brummer had some objection to allowing the Judge in all cases to waive it so Representative Brummer and Representa... Judge Fleck were on the phone, worked out language which is just about the same as this and I'll yield to Representative Brummer in a minute. Then we did have a conference and everybody who signed here spent about an hour going over the language. I'm satisfied with it and I'd like to yield to Representative Brummer so he could either comment it .. on that or add on any further.. or answer any further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Yield to who?"

Deuster: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."



Brummer: "Yes. As the Membership may remember, I was an adamant opponent of giving the Judge the discretion to waive the requirement of the bifurcated hearing provision. After we defeated that several times, I talked to Judge Fleck about the problem that exists in Cook County and apparently the.. the parties or the attorneys used the bifurcated provisions as a negotiating tactic when there is really no contest with regard to the grounds itself. The original proposal was that in .. in Judge Fleck's was that in all cases the Judge could waive the bifurcated provision. I didn't feel that was fair to the attorneys and the parties when they go in with regard to contested grounds and then were ordered by the court potentially to immediately proceed with regard to hearing on property settlement, child custody, support, or whatever the other provisions in the issue were. Upon talking to Judge Fleck I discovered that the problem that existed in Cook County and that is that most of the time the grounds are uncontested and they're merely proved up as in the cases of a default. So that there really is no reason for a bifurcated hearing in those instances. And therefore, we drafted the Conference Committee Report. It is an agreement with Judge Fleck. I think it protects the rights of the parties and the lawyers involved because they will know in advance whether the grounds are going to be contested or whether they are going to be uncontested and if they are uncontested they can immediately proceed to the contested portions of the trial. This will save two trips to the court house by the attorneys, two trips to the court house by the parties, and I feel it adequately answers all the issues involved."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry on this



Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Pullen: "I have two Conference Committee Reports on my desk on House Bill 112, both of which say, 'First Conference Committee Report'. Now I understand that the first one that was distributed had to be corrected because it did not meet the House rules of having the names typed. I'm a little bit concerned and disturbed about the corrected copy. Because not only are there different signatures on the corrected copy, but it also has different language, Mr. Speaker, and I'm wondering how there can be two first Conference Committee Reports. This is highly irregular."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen, have you... Representative Deuster, you look like you were going to be able to tell that answer."

Deuster: "Well, yes I can explain it. It is a little different. What happened is that I had given the Clerk a Conference Committee Report and it did not comply with our rules that it didn't have the names of the Members typed. And so then, when I came back, I discovered that staff had .. and others had different ideas on how to phrase it. So we then had further discussions and the corrected copy that we submitted did have changes in language. That explains it, Penny."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Would you please take a minute to listen to this point? I think it may be important. There are two First Conference Committee reports on this Bill. One says corrected copy. Now I understand that the first one that was distributed yesterday or early today, had to be corrected because it did not meet the House rules of having the names typed on it. However, the Sponsor just indicated that when he took it back to have



the names typed on it, he got different signatures on it and he also had the language changed on it. Now, Mr. Speaker, that makes this a distinct report. It is not a first Conference Committee report. It is a second report without the first ever having been acted on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer. We'll have to refer that to the Parliamentarian. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I would like to point out to the Parliamentarian if he compares the two, the language changes on the second Conference Committee Report as opposed to the first Conference Committee report, on the first Conference Committee report the language 'proved up' was on. The second Conference Committee it merely says 'proved' instead of 'proved up'. Some.. some English expert decided that 'proved' was adequate rather than 'proved up'. I do not think that changes any substantive language whatsoever. The second language change was that instead of 'notwithstanding issue on the pleadings' being at the beginning, it said, 'issue on the pleadings notwithstanding' being added at the end. There are absolutely no substantive changes with regard to the corrected Conference Committee report. It is only a matter of style with regard to drafting. There are no substantive differences. Those errors with regard to drafting were discovered and it was decided that it was more adviseable to issue a corrected Conference Committee report. "

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that the first one was filed in violation of the rules because there were no names typed on there. And it was never filed in the Senate. He further advises me that the.. what appears to be the corrected copy is actually the Conference.. the first legal Conference Committee report and that would be the one that would be discussed. "



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel, for what purpose do you arise?"

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like a verification from the Chair. If you'll look at the corrected copy please. Do you have a copy of that?"

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Alright. Now what do you want? What do you want to know?"

Piel: "Okay. Right above Aaron Jaffe's name, the date, the 30th day of June. Conference Committee was held yesterday. Yesterday was the 29th. There's another technical error. You're looking for technical errors? There's another one on the corrected copy."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is if it was filed, it was submitted the 30th day. That's very possible. When they met..."

Deuster: "I might say, the Senators had adjourned and they couldn't get the Senators' signature because they weren't.. they weren't around. That's why it's dated today."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question prevail?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And we're back to the main question. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "Yes, I think this is a very important Bill that will particularly help reduce the courts' back log in divorce cases in Cook County. The language has been worked out by a lot of attorneys including a representative of the Illinois Bar Association. I think it's responsible and helpful and I would urge your support in adopting the First Conference Committee report to



House Bill 112. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Deuster moves that the House do adopt the first Conference Committee report on House Bill 112. Those in favor, if there's no debate... We had debate. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'aye's, 21 'nay's, 3 answering 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee report by a Constitutional Majority. On the Supplemental Calendar, #2... We have on Nonconcurrences, Senate Bill 580. Representative Ewing. Is Representative Ewing in his seat? Representative Ewing on Nonconcurrency, Senate Bill 580. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to nonrecede from the Amendments and for the appointment of Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewing moves to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 580 and requests a Conference Committee. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the House does refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 580 and a Conference Committee is requested. Senate Bill 587, Bower. On Nonconcurrency. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask that we.. the House not recede from its Amendments and ask for a Conference Committee report. Do not recede and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Bower moves that the House refuse to recede to House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 to Senate Bill 587. On that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I know that this isn't the most im-



portant Bill of the year, but could we have some clue as to the content? Why is this a... Why are these rotten Amendments?"

Bower: "The Senate is asking to drop all of our Amendments which were the first seven of which were adopted in Committee and the other two which were adopted on the floor. Amendment #1 reduces the equipment's appropriation and contractual services. Amendment #2 restores certain reductions made by the Senate of \$109,000. Amendment #3 redistributes grants from the Community Action program.."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I know this isn't very important. We're only taking about hundreds of thousands of dollars and pretty soon we'll be into billions, but I can't hear the Gentleman."

Speaker Matijeich: "Let's... First of all, all unauthorized personnel off the floor. All unauthorized personnel off the floor. Well, we're not going to proceed. Could the doorman tell those people who are unauthorized to remove themselves from the floor? Right now. All unauthorized personnel off the floor. Looks more like a picnic out there than a General Assembly. It is. Alright. Now that we think we've cleared that, now let's have some order from the rest of this. Alright. Proceed now."

Bower: "The... As I said previously, the first seven Amendments were adopted in Committee. The second.. The last two, 8 and 9, were adopted by the full House. Amendment #1 reduces equipment and contractual services by a total of \$85,000. It transfers \$11,200 from personal services into another line item for extra help. House Amendment #2 restores certain reductions made by the Senate for total restoration of \$109,400 in state economic opportunity programs, weatherization programs, and training and technical assistance. House Amendment #3 redistributes grants for the Community Action Program



in accordance with proposed formula changes in House Bill 1996. House Amendment 4 eliminates \$151,700 from the Office of Consumer Services which was added by the Senate. House Amendment #5 restores \$125,400 to the statewide manpower services Section. House Amendment #6 makes technical changes to align state agency grants with the federal fiscal year, corrects typographical errors and other technical changes. House Amendment... And those were all Amendments that were basically agreed to by both Committee staffs. House Amendment #7 which was adopted in Committee deletes all funds for the expenses of the consumer assistance program for a total reduction of \$314,000. House Amendment #8 makes technical corrections to the Bill due to the fact of House Amendment #7 being adopted. And House Amendment #9 restores \$18,000 in CETA money and equipment in the statewide manpower services division."

Skinner: "Could the Sponsor please .. with regard to House Amendment #3, it says here, this was a redistribution of grant in aid allocations for the community based grants. Now we're.. What on earth does that mean? You're cutting that out. Does that mean we're just giving total discretion to this 'son of GOHR'?"

Bower: "Representative Birchler sponsored House Bill 1996 that made substantive changes that.. on how this money would be distributed and this was to bring the appropriation Bill into compliance with House Bill 1996."

Skinner: "Okay. In the Office of Consumer Services, is that the.. the one were the General Assembly is taking money away from the Illinois Public Action Council?"

Bower: "That is correct."

Skinner: "This is our precursor to control of public t.v.?"

Bower: "That is your opinion."

Skinner: "It's probably a fact. Now what is House Amendment



#7 do? What is the Consumer Assistance Program?"

Bower: "Okay. Cal, there are two Amendments that are directed to your first question, your previous question. House Amendment #4 reduces the Senate appropriation for the Office of Consumer Services by \$151,700. That brings it down. House Amendment #7 does away with all of it."

Skinner: "It what? Restores all of it?"

Bower: "Does away with all of it. That eliminates... Number.. Amendment #4 reduces the Senate appropriation for that office and House Amendment #7 does completely away with the program."

Skinner: "We sort.. Four was a trial balloon and 7 is the whole hog."

Bower: "Pardon me? I did not hear you."

Skinner: "I understand. Thank you very much."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bower... Representative Bowman is recognized. You had your light on, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Oh, geez. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to just make an inquiry of the Chair. Are we going to remain on the Order of Nonconcurrency, because I have a motion that I would like to make later.. or how are we handling the Calendar now? Are we going to be on the Order of Nonconcurrency for a while?"

Speaker Flinn: "Supplemental Calendar #2 we're on right now and we're going to go through that and get the Sponsors out there."

Bowman: "Well, okay. It's just that I.. I would like to be able to make...."

Speaker Flinn: "Why don't you come up here? You're interrupting the conversation here on this Bill. Come up and talk to us. We're in the middle of a motion."

Bowman: "You're.. Wait a minute. Mr. Speaker, I can't hear



you very well. You're.. What did you say?"

Speaker Flinn: "We're in the middle of a motion now and you're asking what order we're on. We're in the middle of a motion and we need to get you to come up here and ask the question here. It's not for everybody's consumption anyway."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright. Any further discussion? Representative Vinson."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. And the Sponsor, Representative Bower, to close."

Bower: " Mr. Speaker, I merely ask that the House refuse to recede and that Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has asked that the House refuse to approve the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 587. All those in favor... Just a minute, Representative Totten. I'll get to it. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I thought we could do this on a voice vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we could except there were several calls for a Roll Call."

Bradley: "Well, give them the Roll Call and take their..."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 voting 'aye' and 17 voting 'nay'. And the House refuses to accept the Conference Committee report.. Senate Amendments... House Amendments on Senate Bill 587. And a Conference Committee will be appointed. Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you arise?"



Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the news we've been waiting for all night and I want all of the Members to pay strict attention on this especially when my Bills or Representative Stuffle's Bills come up this evening. But we do have some sandwiches and some lemmon aid and soda and coffee and what have you for all of the Members in the Speaker's Office. This has been through the compliments of the Illinois Police Association and the Police Benevolent Association so if you want to stop by and pick yourself up a ham sandwich and some lemmon aid, you're more than welcome to and anyone who does pick it up they have to vote 'yes' for my vote and also Larry Stuffle's Bills."

Speaker Flinn: "Senate Bill 588. Representative Davis, Jack Davis, 588."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to refuse to recede from Amendment #4 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has refused.. moved to refuse to recede from Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 588. Any discussion? If not, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "What is .. does the Amendment do that we're.. you're refusing to agree on?"

Davis: "The Amendment 4 now that you've asked, Representative Totten, is the.. Incidentally House... Senate Bill 588 is the appropriation for the Department of Law Enforcement..."

Totten: "Good. I was going to ask you that."

Davis: "Amendment #4 is the pay raise Bill for troopers in this state that was so overwhelmingly approved by this House only last week or earlier this week, I should say. There was a deficiency in that adoption by the



Sponsors of the Amendment that left out three or four hundred sworn officers the intention was to have sworn officers and the Amendment needs to be re-worked in Conference Committee so that everybody can have a chance to vote 'yes' or 'no' on a pay raise for all sworn troopers."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would support the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson. He passes. The Gentleman has moved to recede from Amendment #4...."

Davis: "Refuse to recede and that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved... The Gentleman has moved refused to recede from Senate Amendment #.. House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill #588. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. And those.. say 'aye'. Okay. Those opposed say 'no'. The 'aye's have it. And the House refuses to recede from Amendment #4 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 971. Representative Jim Taylor. Jim Taylor is recognized on 971."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I refuse to recede from Senate Amendments #1 and 2 and move that we have a Conference Committee. Senate Amendments # 1 and 2 increases the membership of the Industrial Commission from five to seven Members, increases the availability of the rehabilitation service for injured employees and excuse the Chicago Fire Department paramedics from coverage under this Act. I move to refuse to recede from Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 971. And on that motion, Representative Totten. You had your light on. Representative Totten."

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



Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "I didn't, Jim, understand exactly what the Bill did. Does this have to do with unemployment compensation?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Workmens' compensation, not unemployment compensation."

Totten: "It does not?"

Taylor: "No."

Totten: "Well, you explained the Amendments, but I didn't quite understand the Bill and I just want to make sure what we're sticking in a Conference Committee."

Taylor: "I think that we could work it out just in a Conference Committee. That's why I refuse to recede from it."

Totten: "Well, I don't know how you're going to work it out different. That's what I'm afraid of."

Taylor: "I won't do anything to hurt you, Representative Totten."

Totten: "What choice do I have, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "Vote one way or the other. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill looks pretty good as it is right now. The key Amendment that the Representative is attempting to defend is that every employer shall notify each insured employee who has been granted compensation of his rights to rehabilitative services and advise him where he might be able to find them. I don't see.. I don't see why we should change anything at all. What's wrong with it?"

Taylor: "I am refusing to recede from those Amendments."

Skinner: "You're going to give them hell. Go to it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Taylor has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 971. All those in favor say 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. And the 'aye's have it and the House does refuse



to recede from Amendments #1 and 2 and a Conference Committee will be appointed." Senate Bill 1150. Representative Dawson is recognized for a motion on 1150."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee (sic), I refuse to recede on Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1150 and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to..."

Skinner: "Come on. Let us know what it is."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm trying to.. I'm trying to make.. state the motion. Let me state the motion and...The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1150 and on the motion, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Alright. What is Senate Amendment #1?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Amendment #1 is basically the minimum wage law of the state, the new proposal."

Leinenweber: "Wait a minute. What was that?"

Dawson: "It raises the state levels of minimum wage up to the federal level."

Leinenweber: "That's what the Amendment does?"

Dawson: "That is what Amendment #1 was, yes."

Leinenweber: "And you are moving to nonconcur with that?"

Dawson: "Yes. I am asking for a Conference Committee because we've worked out basically an agreement between the manufacturers we hope and organized labor. There's going to be some reduced rates in some of the wages."

Leinenweber: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Simms: "Would you tell me what manufacturers that you worked out any agreement with?"

Dawson: "We didn't say we worked it out yet. That's why



we're asking for the Conference Committee."

Simms: "Aha. I can imagine what's coming back."

Dawson: "Hang on tight."

Simms: "I will."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the Gentleman.

Representative Dawson has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1150. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

The 'aye's have it. And the House refuses to recede from Amendment #1 to House Bill.... Senate Bill 1150 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1272. Representative Emil Jones for a motion on 1272."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Emil Jones, wait a minute.

Representative Beatty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, 1272.. House Bill 1272 is my Conference Committee. Oh, it's Senate Bill. I'm sorry. Go ahead."

Speaker Flinn: "... Representative Emil Jones proceed."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to not recede from House Amendments #1,2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1272."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendments #1,2 and 3 on Senate Bill ... Just a minute. Representative Jones, the Senate has concurred in Amendments 1 and 2, only #3 your motion would apply to. The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #3.. Let me state the motion, Representative Skinner, please. The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1272. And on that motion, Representative Skinner is recognized."

Skinner: "I beg of the Sponsors of these excellent Bills to give us just a scintilla of a clue as to what they're about. I mean even the agency's name."



Speaker Flinn: "Do you wish to have.. question the Gentleman?"

Skinner: "What the devil is this about?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Jones: "This is the annual awards claim for FY '79 for the Court of Claims. This is what this 1272 is all about."

Skinner: "And what are you receding from or concurring with?"

Jones: "I refuse to recede in Amendment #3 to this particular Bill."

Skinner: "What's it about? Medley movers?"

Jones: "If you know, then there's no need for you to ask."

Skinner: "Excuse me. I couldn't understand you."

Jones: "I said, Representative Skinner, if you are doing your job as a Representative you know what it is so there's no need to ask."

Skinner: "I hardly think that deserves a retort but I'm tempted to give one."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten on the motion."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and well, I've played pool with Mr. Jones and I know you've got to keep an eye on him. I wonder if he would tell me what the Amendment #3 did?"

Taylor: "Amendment #3 is an Amendment that was adopted by this House to this appropriation Bill. It deals with a moving company in the amount of 69,000 dollars I believe."

Totten: "Now, Representative Taylor just told me what it was."

Taylor: "Why it's the same Amendment that you have voted for in the past."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'

All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

The 'aye's have it. The main question is put. Repre-



representative Emil Jones to close. You wish to close? The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1272. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The House refuses to recede from Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1272 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Supplemental #2 Calendar Supplemental #2 appears House Bill 292. Representative Terzich is recognized for a motion."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur with the first Committee Conference report on House Bill 292 which deals with the arson investigators. When the Bill originally went over to the Senate it had a subpoena power with approval of the State's Attorney and what the Conference Committee report stipulates that subpoena power for arson investigators is restored subject to approval of the court and I would move for concurrence with the Conference Committee report."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that the House adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill 292 and on that motion, Representative Vinson."

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

Terzich: "Yaah."

Vinson: "Representative, does this Bill in any way affect any easements in any part of the state?"

Terzich: "Easements?"

Vinson: "Easements."

Terzich: "I hope not. No, it has nothing to do with it. This is with arson investigators."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the Gentleman has moved that the House adopt Conference Committee report on House Bill 292. All those in favor vote 'aye';



those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye' and nine... five voting 'no'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed and the Conference Committee report is accepted by the House.. adopted by the House. On the Regular Calendar, page 6, appears Senate Bill 807. A Conference Committee report. Representative Beatty recognized for a motion."

Beatty: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just one minute please."

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

Matijevich: "I guess I've rised on a reverse point of personal privilege."

Speaker Flinn: "State your reverse point."

Matijevich: "Because the other day I rose three times in one day and complained bitterly because one of my downstate leaders was using his office to allow people from DOT to drag downstate Democrats into his office to make all kinds of deals and phoney promises. Now right now there's DOT people on the floor of the House. A Department of Transportation Bill is not before us. They're here illegally outside of the rules of the House. They're using Cissy Stiehl's office so I guess they are bi-partisan and I think the people in the gallery, the taxpayers all over the State of Illinois ought to know that that's the way that you get ripped-off. You get ripped-off not by us, the people right here who are doing our jobs; you get ripped-off by the bureaucracy, the people that have been here for years, the people who know the engineers, the ones that are going to make all those fantastic fees. And that's who's ripping you off. And I can't stand it when they use our House of Representatives, paid for



by the taxpayers, use it illegally, violate our House rules, use the outer offices to make empty promises. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think you ought to use the power of your Chair as I did before and chase all these unauthorized personnel and we should not go with any other business of the House until all of the floor of the House is cleared. We don't have much time to do in this General Assembly, but in that short time let's do it right."

Speaker Flinn: "Will all unauthorized people leave the floor of the House and will the doormen and his assistants please check the floor of the House and have those people leave? Representative Matijevec is absolutely right. Representative Cullerton, for what purpose do you arise?"

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, what order of business are we on?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we're on..."

Cullerton: "Conference Committee reports?"

Speaker Flinn: "We're on 807 right now."

Cullerton: "I just wanted to know. Are you going to go onto Conference Committee reports or are you going to skip around?"

Speaker Flinn: "We're trying to get things moving around here and you've got a request, drop up and talk to Dave here. Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you arise?"

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just ask very, very calmly but very seriously if we could make a request of the Department of Transportation to please stay off of the floor until their legislation is presented? We have a lot of work to do and emotions are high. The Governor's program is being debated right now. We want to look at this very carefully. We would appreciate if the Department of Transportation would stay off the floor un-



til they have legislation."

Speaker Flinn: "Your point is well taken. I'd think that all unauthorized persons and especially the Department of Transportation because of what we've got in front of us, should stay off the floor. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you arise?"

Winchester: "Well, I would like to know what your definition of unauthorized is. I have three Bills that are related to transportation matters. I have asked the Transportation liaisons to work with me on that legislation to advise me on certain matters and I would like to have him with me, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I'm not asking those who are authorized to leave. I'm asking those who are unauthorized to leave. Let's get back to the business at hand. Representative Getty on Senate Bill 807. Representative Beatty I mean. I'm sorry."

Beatty: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we.. the House previously passed this Bill and we had.. this is a Bill dealing with the General Assembly Members and the Members of the Judiciary increasing the increment at age 60 from 2% to 3%. If you will recall, the House approved it and now the Senate is acceding to what the House has done. The Senate Sponsor of this Bill, Senator Egan, has indicated that he will fund this increment in the Omnibus Bill for the current year. And in... considering the inflation we have the House previously passing this, I ask for an affirmative vote of this Conference Committee report."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt the Conference Committee report on House Bill... (sic) 807. And on that motion, Representative Skinner is recognized."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I stand to v.. I rise to stand against this pay increase Bill. Now there's a lot of hypocrisy



on the House floor this afternoon when we had a Bill up that would raise the district allowance from 17 thousand to 20 thousand dollars. None of that money would go into our pockets. None of it could go into the pockets of any of our even shirt sleeved relatives because of the strict anti-nepotism law which applies. This on the other hand will go directly into our pockets. Now I've got the Roll Call here of all the hypocrites on this House that didn't want to vote to raise the district allowance even though the rent has gone up 50% in the Chicago metropolitan area for office space in the last two years, even though the cost of gasoline has gone up 29% since January 1st. And incidently, my secretary can't take an RTA bus to work. This on the other hand will raise our salaries after we retire. Now if the press wants a Roll Call to make fun of the General Assembly, let them take this Roll Call. Let them not take the legislative .. the district allowance Roll Call. Incidently, Representative, whom I admire very much, how are we paying for this in the Omnibus Bill? Is it coming out of the general fund?"

Beatty: "I think you'll have to wait or talk to Senator Egan about this. I don't know. He's putting the money in there."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we don't even know where the money's coming from I don't think we ought to vote for the Bill. Are we increasing the deduction that we have taken out of your salary every month to pay for this pension increase? Is that correct? Does the Sponsor know?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Please repeat your question."

Skinner: "Do you know whether we are in... our deduction out of our monthly paycheck will go up in order to pay for this increase in pensions for those who are retired



General Assembly Members who happen to be over 60 years of age?"

Beatty: "It is presently... I yield to Representative Terzich. He knows the answer. If you would.. Mr. Speaker, would you turn on the mike of Representative Terzich?"

Skinner: "...I'd certainly like his name..."

Beatty: "Representative Terzich, please. If you'd turn him on."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Representative Skinner, apparantly you don't know the difference between your salary and your pension, but this happens to be for our retirees and if we can vote for public aid recipients or anyone else who's inflicted by inflation, we can ignore the fact that we amended every system in the state, the state system to 3%, and that we're paying twice the amount of money right now for the same... for a lesser benefit, then you don't vote for this. But this is for our senior citizens. It's for our people over age 60 who are affected by inflation the same way. We adjusted this benefit for about 150,000 members of state retirement systems and certainly we shouldn't ignore our retirees anymore. As far as paying for it is concerned, we are paying for it whether or not the local units of government or the Governor has even funded the pension system, that's on his shoulders. However, we have a sufficient amount of money in the post retirement benefit to satisfy the small minor adjustment of one percent.. of one percent that you get at age 60 and maybe you might have to wait 40 years for it yourself if you ever get out of here."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hudson. Representative Skinner..."

Hudson: "Thank you.."

Speaker Flinn: "I thought you had..."



Skinner: "Obviously the Gentleman has not answered the question. This is an increase from 2% to 3% and anybody that knows simple math knows that's a 50% increase. If it's not coming out of our.. an increase deduction, then our pension fund which is grossly underfunded, I think the only one worse under... that.. the only one that is funded worse is the Judges's pension fund which certainly must be at least funded at 20 or 30% of the accrued liabilities. It seems to me that this is an irresponsible vote at this point in time. There is absolutely no reason that this Bill should be passed in view of the just hideous Roll Call that was cast this afternoon. If we're afraid to raise the district allowance, none of which goes into our pockets, certainly we should be terrified to vote for a pension increase which, indeed, is the same as a future salary increase. Because that will be our salary once we go to the happy hunting land, happy hunting ground of retired Legislators and after tonight, if 107 people vote for that atrocious Bill that we haven't seen yet, there may be a lot of people going to the happy hunting ground a lot faster than they think."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schoeberlein."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed. The 'aye's have it and the Sponsor is recognized to close. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this measure has previous passed the House. The Senate has now agreed to the wisdom of the House putting us on the same par with some other Legi... with some other pension funds who received a similar change during the last Session of the General Assembly. Contrary to



what you have heard from the Representative from McHenry, this is not a pay increase for General Assembly Members. This is an increment that will be received by Members who are long since gone from these halls, who are subject to inflation. The Representative from McHenry has often times supported senior citizens legislation. This, indeed, is senior citizen legislation. There is no reason why retired Members should not be given consideration for inflation. Just as the funds that we have in our pension fund are being advanced at much higher rates today. Nine and perhaps ten percent benefitting from the inflation, so should these Members benefit. The Senate, for a change, has seen the light and I think we should once again pass this measure. I ask for your green light."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 807. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. We'll turn off the T.V. lights while we're explaining votes. I've got a number of people on. Wrong light. Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is a great distinction between this and a salary increase. If you had been a Member of the Pension Committee, Representative Skinner, I believe you would understand that separate payments are made by the people in the retirement system to pay for this increment. Because this portion is deducted from the salary of those who are currently in the system. It is invested and it becomes a separate part of the benefit. Other systems have shown in the past that by investing this money they are able to be self sustaining and to be able to add on this increment to go back to the recipients. It's totally self sustaining and I urge a 'yes' vote on



this particular measure."

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

One minute. The timer's on."

Sandquist: "Yes,..."

Speaker Flinn: "Turn Sandquist on."

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe I have a conflict of interest here because my Mother is one of those senior citizens widows who is drawing from my Dad's pension. But I will vote my conscience."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative J.J. Wolf, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, you know, I'm usually pretty conservative when it comes to matters of pension and I did not vote for this measure before because it did not require a contribution on the part of the Members of the General Assembly. That has since been corrected. There is now a one half a cent contribution required which was not required of the other system. So I think that it's a good Bill as it now stands and I'm prepared to support it and vote 'aye' and hope we get enough votes to pass it."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. I fail to punch the Speaker 'aye', so mark the Speaker 'aye'. I just got the word. Alright. We'll verify the Speaker here even though there's not a verification. The Roll has been taken up yonder. Speaker votes 'aye' and, on this question there are 89 'aye's, 53 'nay's, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. O'Brien 'aye'. No? Or 'aye'? 'Aye'. Senate Bill 811. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is also a pension Bill. In this the House recedes from House



Amendment #1. What we did was the House refused to accept the judgment of the Senate in this case again. We refused to give Federal Judges a pension when they're on the Federal bench and we have kept that in this report. And so that remains. One of the changes is a change relative to 'fiduciary' standards of the trustees of the various retirement systems. This change was suggested by our Federal Congressman from the area generally down this way, Paul Simon, former Representative, and the third change is a change that was previously presented to the . . . to us here and was passed in another form but it did not previously pass the Senate. Now the Senate has passed this Conference Committee report and the third change is that a surviving spouse of a Member who is otherwise qualified to exercise the alternate formula may elect to receive his survivor's benefit computed under that formula. This change would allow the surviving spouse of a Member of the General Assembly retirement system to have the deceased Member's annuity computed under the alternate formula and then apply for a widow or widow's annuity. As you know, the spouses of the Members of the General Assembly contribute a certain portion for their pension. It is unusual for a male Member to have a pension very long or in many cases the male Member doesn't even survive. For some reason, the Ladies live longer. The Ladies and the spouses are paying a percentage for their pension. This is a negligible cost according to the Pension Laws Committee and I think it brings equity into the system. If a Member is eligible for a pension and passes away, it puts his widow in his shoes and she can go ahead and pay whatever money that's got to be paid and make whatever election he could have made. And I don't think there's anything controversial about this having previously passed the



House. I'll be glad to answer any questions on this.
I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves to adopt the Conference
Committee report on Senate Bill 811. Any discussion?
Representative Jake Wolf."

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

Beatty: "Yes, I will."

Wolf: "I just have one question here. Looking for a Judge
to earn credits while serving as a Federal Judge, is
that a Federal Judge who has returned to the state
judicial system?"

Beatty: Pardon me? I can't hear you."

Wolf: "Apparently the second point in House Amendment #1
provided Judges to earn credits while serving as a
Federal Judge. Is that some for some who maybe have
served as Federal Judge and then returned to state
service?"

Beatty: "That was taken out."

Wolf: "Oh, it was taken out."

Beatty: "Yes."

Wolf: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters. Peters. He passes.
Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "What was the Paul Simon part of this? I didn't
understand it."

Beatty: "Paul Simon said there's some federal regulation
saying the 'fidiciary' standards are supposed to be.."

Friedrich: "Okay. Thank you."

Beatty: "Put on the pension system."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Beatty: "This puts them on all the systems."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House
adopt Conference Committee report #1 on Senate Bill 811.



All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye' and 21 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. And the House does adopt Conference Committee report #1. Senate Bill 1272. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, we have previously heard Senate Bill 1272. It's House Bill 1272."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, I'm sorry. You're right."

Beatty: "On House Bill 1272, this is a Bill that was put in by the Secretary of State and the Farm Bureau wanted an Amendment on it dealing with not-for-profit corporations. The Conference Committee report has only one change. The change is the word 'stockholders' to the word 'Members' as there are no stockholders in not-for-profit corporations. I'd appreciate an affirmative vote on this minor change."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Since we're talking about a Conference Committee report rather than an Amendment I wonder whether the Sponsor could tell us what the Bill does please?"

Beatty: "Yes, the Bill amends the Not-For-Profit Corporation Act. It provides that a corporation may change its registered office address... or registered agents and that Amendment is where the change takes place. And that amends the paragraph on general powers of general Not-For-Profit Corporation Act and it was put in at the request of the Farm Bureau. It puts it.. It makes it consistent with the Not-For-Profit Corporation Act."

Pullen: "This Bill provides that a not-for-profit corporation may change its registered office address or registered agent by filing a statement of change or indicating



the change on the annual report?"

Beatty: "Yes, I believe that is the case."

Pullen: "What is the difference between that and the current law? What kind of change are we talking about?"

Beatty: "Well, this makes it consistent with the regular corporation. It puts it into the same status as the general corporations who are able to change in the same form. This makes it easier for a not-for-profit corporation to amend its charter."

Pullen: "Well, what are the provisions now for that? Do they have to file a report within a certain number of days or...?"

Beatty: "Well, this provision is actually a provision dealing with indemnification, the provision that the Farm Bureau has. It's . . . 'the general powers of the not-for-profit corporations provides the power to indemnify all of its officers, directors, and employees' in an added paragraph and it adds that 'the corporation may indemnify any person who was or is a party who is . . . the party in any . . . any lawsuit.' What it is is it's protecting the people who work for not-for-profit corporations allowing them to buy insurance so that they take some action people don't like that they're . . . they're not making any profit themselves or getting paid and it protects their interest in things such as the Fram Bureau where . . . or maybe a neighborhood corporation or a charitable institution."

Pullen: "Well, what about the original Bill which had to do with the . . . the filing of the report on the change of registered agent or registered address? What is the current law on that?"

Beatty: "Well, the current law is you'd have to file a specific form. This makes it much easier. And these things are done . . . should be done with less formality."



Pullen: "So this is saying that they could just indicate that change on the annual report rather than filing an immediate report after they've done this?"

Beatty: "That's right."

Pullen: "Alright. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. And the 'aye's have it. The motion carried. Who's the Sponsor of this?"

Beatty: "I am."

Speaker Redmond: "Well..."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote on this noncontroversial Bill that is in here at the insi...at the request of the Alan Dixon and also the Farm Bureau."

Speaker Redmond: "What was your motion, Representative? There is a little.. little problem up here."

Beatty: "To adopt the Conference Committee report, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the First Conference Committee report to House Bill 1272. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 1 'no', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee report to House Bill 1272. 375. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I think the Board should show that that's Senate Bill 375 to begin with."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, on Senate Bill 375 First Conference Committee report the Conference Committee report provides that the Senate should accept the Bill



in the form that it passed the House of Representatives with Amendments 1 and 4. This is the early retirement Bill that passed out of this House the other day with, I believe, 116 votes. The Conference Committee does indeed place the Bill in the same form that it left the House of Representatives. We debated this at great length the other day. The Bill provides for a number of provisions with the amendatory version that were agreed to with the Chicago Board of Education, the downstate teachers. It is not in perfect form in terms of what the downstate school Boards want, but we've worked as best we can to put together the most acceptable compromise possible. The Bill would provide for 80% of its pension cost. The Bill would further according to the downstate teachers' pension system well, it would cost about five million dollars in the ensuing year. Without this Bill the downstate teachers' pension system estimates the potential cost in the coming year in the absence of the Bill at as much as eighty million dollars in additional costs. I'll be glad to answer any questions at this time. I would move that the House adopt Conference Committee report #1 to Senate Bill 375."

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

McCourt: "Will the Sponsor yield to some questions, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McCourt: "Could you tell the Body, Mr. Stuffle, exactly what the teachers' pension benefit is right now? That is, at what age may they retire and receive their full pension?"

Stuffle: "As you know, Representative McCourt, what the Bill does and the effect of the whole question is to eliminate the discount for retirement between age 55 and 60. Currently you have to have 35 years of ser-



vice to retire at age 55 without a discount in the pension amount. If you have less than 35 years of service, if you're under age 60 but over 55, there's a discount of one half of one percent a month up to a 30% discount at age 55."

McCourt: "Alright. Isn't it not true that at age 60 you only have to serve ten years as a teacher rather than 35 at age 55 to get your full pension benefit? Isn't that not true?"

Stuffle: "Well, your question obviously leads to some absurd consequences because the pension with ten years of service would be about 25% of what it would be with 35 years of service if you can call that a full pension at age 60."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a very important Bill. Now there's.. there's no group in our society that does more for.. for children than teachers. But, at the same time, this is a pension Bill. Now whatever we do to this system reflects on all the other public pension systems. Now, the public pension systems have all been based on the rationale that a person should work until he's no longer useful in that particular field of endeavor. Now they realize that in certain pensions.. certain type of public employment like police and fire, that a person is not really up to doing the same type of work after 50 or 55. But in all the other public pension systems, the normal retirement age is age 60. Now what we're doing here, we're saying to one group of public employees that we're going to let them retire at age 55. Now that means that at age 55 a teacher is surely not superannuated. A teacher is in the prime of being at that age. That person then at age 55 can go out and get another job and end up possibly with two pensions. Now, as I understand it,



the other night someone made the representation that a teacher at age 55 is running out of gas. And for that reason, we should let them retire at age 55. Well, I'm telling you that the taxpayers of this state are running out of money and for that reason alone, this Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, could the Sponsor give us a couple of practical examples? Let's say I'm.."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now. Please give the Gentleman order."

Skinner: "Well let's say I'm 55 and I started working when I was 35 years old and I'm now at 55 earning \$20,000 a year. What do I have to do to get out of this job that I hate?"

Stuffle: "Representative Skinner, the Bill provides that if you were at 55, there's a five year schedule of payments partially by the employer and partially by the employee. The Bill provides that if you were to retire at 55 as opposed to 56,7,8, or 9 or before 60, the employee would have to kick in 35% of his or her final salary. "

Skinner: "\$11,000 then..."

Stuffle: "If you're asking me how it works in terms of the payments and what it costs or you're just asking me what you as the employee would have to do? That's what you'd have to do."

Skinner: "Tell me what it.. I've got to kick in \$7,000 over a five year period?"

Stuffle: "I said if you were 55 the contribution would be 35% of your salary that year. If you were 56, the contribution would be 28%."

Skinner: "Alright. So I'm 55, my salary is \$20,000, 35% times \$20,000 is \$7,000."

Stuffle: "One shot, \$7,000. You elect to do that."



Skinner: "Okay. And then what do I get for that \$7,000?"

Stuffle: "You get an elimination of the discount that exists now which is 30%, if you were 55."

Skinner: "So that means that I'm going to get 100% pension when I reach what age?"

Stuffle: "That means you could get a 55... a pension at 55 as you can now. The only difference would be there would be no discount and you'd have to pay for part of the elimination of the discount to pay for the pension costs. And the value of the thing obviously is that that \$20,000 teacher could and would be replaced by someone on the bottom end of the salary schedule. If you were here the other day, you would have heard me estimate conservatively the estimate of the retirement system is that they could save 99 million dollars in local salary costs over a five year period under this Bill and if this Bill were not passed, given what is going on now, which is the ballooning of salaries in the final year of service, that the cost for the system next year according to the head of the retirement system without the Bill could be as high as 80 million dollars without the Bill."

Skinner: "Then you're convinced this is a good deal for the taxpayers in contrast to what the.. the speaker before me tried to convey? Is that correct?"

Stuffle: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last part of that."

Skinner: "You think it's a pretty good deal all the way around."

Stuffle: "I submit that the arguments I made the other day and today are indeed accurate. I have taken my figures as to cost to the system, as to savings to the system without.. with the Bill, as opposed to cost without and the savings to the school district to be accurate. I have studied this issue for many years including numerous reports from other states where this has been



put into being and particularly the report made some two years ago by the Office of Education which looked at this whole issue."

Skinner: "I certainly hope you're right. I'm going to follow your lead."

Speaker Redmond : "Anything further? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aya's have it. The motion carried. Who's the Sponsor? I have a little con... Representative Stuffle. I have a little competition up here. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, indeed if you only looked at this report or the Bill in the vacuum you would see that there would be a pension cost. I pointed that out. In the absence of this Bill as I also pointed out, the pension cost, in the absence of the Bill, I reiterate, according to the system's head, downstate teachers the cost of the Bill... the cost of this program in the absence of this Bill next year would be approximately 14 times higher than what the Bill costs. The Bill caps the salary increase in the last year. The Bill provides that the program would self destruct in five years so we can take a look at it. If we don't want it after that, we can end it. The Bill provides further for a one hundred and thirty-five percent final salary payment for a person who retires at 55 under the program without a discount. And I reiterate to you also, I think that taxpayer out there is concerned with the bottom line. We're saving money to the system if we put this in against what's happening now. And the conservative estimate of three thousand retirements against the average salary types that would be



going out under this system in five years would yield an estimated savings in salaries at the local school district level of 99 million dollars. I urge us to adopt this report."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the First Conference Committee report to Senate Bill 375. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd hope to have asked a question during debate but the motion for the previous question was.. was passed. Maybe the Sponsor can answer the question in his explanation. There seems to be a.. a substantial saving here because of the fact that high priced teachers will be resigning and their place will be taken by younger teachers at lower salary scale. Is that correct? Oh, well, I really want to know what the additional cost of the pension system itself and its percentage of funding by this, irrespective of salaries, you might say, from .. Okay?"

Stuffle: "In explaining my vote, let me answer that question. If we just look at the pension system aspects, Representative Mugalian, the downstate teacher pension system tells us that the current system which we're trying to cap what's going on now.. What's going on now is they're ballooning pensions up 30 and 40% that is salaries, the last year so as to knock out the discount problem. That's a problem now and the system tells us if that's goes on and we don't cap it and have early retirement program, this could cost 80 million dollars next year without the Bill. With the Bill the cost is estimated at five million."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Friedrich?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think you all know that hardly anyone ever pays as much into a pension system as



they get out. I think it's also obvious if you take you pension at 55, you're going to be drawing ten more years than if you took it at 65. Our teachers pension fund is now very greatly underfunded as is all the rest the pension plans. This is going to really put a burden on the teachers pension system and I don't know how you're going to solve it, but I can tell you now that down the road and this self destruct in five years doesn't impress me because once it's put into effect, it'll never be destructed."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 26 'no'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee report. On the top of page 5, Senate Bill 1183. Representative C.M. Stiehl. Representative Christensen.

Representative Stiehl, for what purpose do you arise?"

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, take this out of the record for now."

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

Christensen: "I'm the Sponsor of that Bill, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor, Mr. Clerk? Okay.

Read the letter. Read the letter, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Dear Speaker Redmond, please replace Representative Celeste Stiehl, who is handling Senate Bill 1183, of which I am Chief Sponsor with Representative Ray Christensen."

Speaker Redmond: "According to our rules, that's the right of the Senate Sponsor. Representative Christensen on Senate Bill 1183."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move not to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1183."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Vinson: "Could you describe to me what the Amendment is, Sir?"

Christensen: "They are all easement Amendments."

Vinson: "I beg your pardon?"

Christensen: "They are all easement Amendments."

Vinson: "Will you read to me the list of the counties
where they are located?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen, will you
repeat your motion?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I asked the Sponsor to respond to
a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. That's where we are. Okay. Repre-
sentative Christensen."

Christensen: "House Amendment #1 revises the title to enact
to release certain highways easements and to restore cer-
tain rights, access rights, state... that the State
of Illinois acquired highway easements or access rights
or both to the properties described in Sections 1 through
47 that the State of Illinois no longer has any use
for such easements and access rights and wishes to
vacate and release such easements and restore such
access rights upon payment of the appraised value
thereof, inserts descriptions of property in amounts
of appraised value for these pieces of property. These
additions are duplicates of the following Bills with
counties they affect; House Bill 1098, St. Clair County.
House Bill 1099, Madison County. Could I have some
order please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Christensen: "The last one I mentioned was House Bill ...
The last one I mentioned was House Bill 1099, Madison
County. House Bill 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, and 1106
Cumberland County. House Bill 1107 Effingham County.
House Bill 1108.. House Bill 1108 .. I can't find it
here. Madison County. House Bill 1109, Fayette County.
House Bill 1112, ... House Bill 1113, and 114 (sic) Clark



County. House Bill 115 (sic), 1116, 1117.. "

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

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I don't really understand what kind of song he's singing. He's reciting numbers to us. What's this, in response to?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ask you question, Representative Vinson."

Ebbesen: "Well, my question..."

Speaker Redmond: "No, no, no. Representative Vinson was propounding a question to Mr. Christensen."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir. And he's responding to the question. I asked him to list the easements for us in this Amendment that he's asking us to concur with."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that seems kind of dilatory. Can't he..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he's... I think he's within his rights. Representative Cullerton, for what purpose do you arise?"

Cullerton: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're right in the middle of an inquiry here."

Cullerton: "He's through answering."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen."

Christensen: "This is what the easement does. Senate Bill 1183 releases an easement over certain described property adjacent to FAP route 103 in St. Clair County."

Vinson: "Is that the full list Representative?"

Christensen: "Mostly."

Vinson: "I beg your pardon?"

Christensen: "Mostly."

Vinson: "What else is in the list?"

Christensen: "It's all on page 723 on your book."

Vinson: "Yes. What is in the list, Sir? Would you tell



us the counties where these easements are please?"

Christensen: "St. Clair County..."

Vinson: "Is there any easement in Kankakee County?"

Christensen: "No, there is not."

Vinson: "There is no easement in Kankakee County in this Bill?"

Christensen: "No, Sir."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative McCourt?"

McCourt: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McCourt: "Mr. Christensen, I noticed in Section 2 on page 4..."

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

Conti: "Well, I don't know. I've had a long day. Everybody else has had a long day. We are talking about some easements. We're giving some property away. I don't know what county we're giving it away. If it's the General Assembly that's making the noise, I wish you'd use that hammer. If it 's the gallery making the noise, I wish you'd clear the gallery. We're spending some money here tonight and this is where our record stands on the last night of this year, the last night of this Session. I'd like to know what's going on so that when I put my vote up there I can explain it when I go home."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think that something's very wrong here. And it really concerns me. Now, the Sponsorship was taken away on this Bill because I wouldn't call it right away. And why wouldn't I call it? Of course, I wouldn't call it. Look at all of these easements on here, \$86,000 worth. This new Sponsor doesn't know anything about these



easements. I've been holding these for the appraisals to get answers to some of the questions that were being asked. I think..."

Speaker Redmond: "It seems to me that that stuff's improper questions in debate... improper procedure in debate, Representative Stiehl. Let's get to Representative Christensen .. to his motion. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for two brief questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "Representative Christensen, I see here that there's property located in Rock Island County and Representatives from the 36th District who represent the said County are not familiar with that territory is. Could you give us the legal description?... No, I'm not familiar with the Amendment. I was relying on Cissy Stiehl to handle this. I have a great deal of confidence in her. I also have a great confidence in the Sponsor now. I just feel kind of hurt that they can't work this together in the spirit of bi-partisan support for such a fine piece of legislation. It's not often that in the closing hours of the Session such as this that we're able to consider one Bill that encompasses so many other House Bills and comes into Senate Bills sponsored by the fine Senator from East St. Louis who's cohort over here from East St. Louis, who once ran for Mayor of that fine city, usually has a Bill such as this with some sort of an easement for East St. Louis to improve that fine city which was once one of America's finest cities, which I understand has very fine wide roads, is not in need of any additional help..... Not able to locate that, I have another question. Prior to my co.. my seatmate here, Representative Harris, joining the General Assembly we were fortunate to have Clyde L. Choate here whose birth-



day usually falls in the month of June and we usually would sing his birthday greetings to him, the ballad of Clyde ^{Choute} Schault. However, since he's not here any longer, we must think about Bald Knob Hill, which is in Union County, which is now represented by Representative Harris and Winchester and I know Representative Winchester...."

Speaker Redmond: "That doesn't sound like a question to me.

Representative Bullock, for what purpose do you arise?"

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

I think this House is being demeaned and defaced with the conduct that is going on here tonight. You're sitting in that Chair and I think you have a moral obligation to get us some order. I agree that important decisions are being made, but I think we ought to keep our questions to either the concurrent Amendment or say nothing. And, Mr. Speaker, I think you ought to get order in this House and I think you ought to run this House in the manner that you're accustomed to doing it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. Representative Christensen to close. Representative Christensen to close."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, I move not to recede from Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1183."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen, your motion was what? Representative Christensen, what was your motion?"

Christensen: "I made the motion not to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1183."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Christensen's



motion that the House not recede from Amendment #4..(sic) to Senate Bill 1183 and request a Roll Call. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Wait a minute now. What's... Representative Christensen."

Christensen: "I ask that it be sent to a Conference Committee. I did not ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 86 'aye', 74 'no'. The motion prevails. 2348. 2348. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification.

Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, you called the next Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I did.."

Lechowicz: "A new point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "I called 2348. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there were plenty of people trying to get your attention for a verification. You knew that. And I think the only fair thing for you to do would be to go back and verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "I did.. I just called 2348..."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker.. Mr. Speaker, the fair thing to do would be to go back and verify the Roll Call..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan.."

Hanahan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Let's keep an orderly House here tonight. You made your ruling. You moved to another Bill. The Minority Leader knows that the only alternative that he has is an appeal the ruling of the Chair....."

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

Friedland: "Parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your inquiry? Parliamentarian, will



you come here?"

Friedland: "I wondered if any portions of this Bill were in violation of Rule 32-G?"

Speaker Redmond: "The rule does not apply to this point of the proceedings. Representative Piel, for what purpose do you arise?"

Piel: "Mr. Speaker, for the last six months I've heard many, many times that the last night becomes a dog and pony show. Now let's face reality. When you've got half of this side of the aisle asking for a verification and asking for your attention, there is no way.. Mr. Hanahan, I'm sorry, but I'm talking to the Chair. What is your point?"

Speaker Redmond: "The House will please come to order. Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hanahan: "The Gentleman full well knows that his only right right at this moment is to appeal the ruling of the Chair, not to go on with anxieties and all sorts of other reasons he may want to discuss here now. If he doesn't like your ruling, let him make that motion."

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

Piel: "Before I was so rudely interrupted I was asking a question of the Chair. Now, it's quite obvious that the Minority Leader had a question of the Chair. Half of this side of the aisle was trying to get your attention. Now I don't think that you're deaf, Mr. Speaker. I mean, in all fairness, you know, they did ask for a.. you know, a verification of the Roll Call. In the future seeings as you've already crossed off the Board, there's nothing we can go back to. In the future I wish you would please, you know, at least clean out the air so we can hear this side of the aisle and not just from your right ear."

Speaker Redmond: "2348, Representative Winchester. Representa-



tive Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not a very complicated piece of legislation..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conli, will you please sit down? Every.. The Members please be in their seats."

Winchester: "I would move... I would move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2348."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I believe I had a motion pending on file

which takes precedent over the Representative's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there a motion on file? Read the motion."

Clerk Leone: "Motion to move to strike the enacting clause."

Speaker Redmond: "Sponsor of the motion?"

Clerk Leone: "Daniels-Matijevich-Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

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

I have filed a motion to strike the enacting clause of House Bill 2348. And in so doing, I have asked this House to place before us a decision of whether or not it wants to use this Bill as reported to us as a vehicle for the proposed Thompson-Byrne sales tax increase program for the funding of the RTA and the Department of Transportation program. During the last week we, those of us from the suburban collar county area, along with many Members of the suburban Cook County delegation, have met in a spirit of bi-partisan cooperation in an attempt to come up with alternatives to a program that has been outlined to us that we have found to be totally unacceptable because of the fact that it would cause many of us to violate campaign pledges and promises that we have made to people in our district and to people of the State of Illinois that we would not have a part during our term of office in imposing any new taxes or the increasing of any taxes on the people of the State of Illinois. Without



legislative participation the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor of our State have placed before us a program, a program which would indeed call for new taxes, call for a sales tax of one percent on the people of Cook County, a sales tax of one half percent on the people of DuPage County, and a sales tax of one quarter percent on four other outlying counties surrounding Cook County. Along with that, there has been a proposal that through this tax there be generated an additional one hundred million dollars during FY '80 for the funding of the Regional Transportation Authority, one hundred million dollars more than they estimated in their budget. During the year FY '81 it would drawn in approximately two hundred million dollars more than estimated in their budget for purposes of the RTA funding. These taxes, these new taxes proposed by the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor of Illinois would be drawn from the six collar counties, six area around Chicago. Suffering the most in this new tax would be the suburban Cook County area in an estimated payment of one hundred and thirty-four point three million dollars during the year FY '80 compared to the 5% gas tax of 29.7 million dollars. Coupled in all of this was a very critical portion of the plan calling for a dedesignation of the cross town and Franklin subway. We were eventually advised that along with this of necessity would be the floating of an additional four hundred million dollars in series A bonds, four hundred million dollars necessary for federal matching and originally proposed four hundred million dollars to be given to the RTA regional area for roads and winterization projects. Along with that it was proposed an additional two hundred million dollars in series B bonds for purposes of mass transportation in the State of Illinois. We now find.. we now discover that there is the absolute pos-



sibility that not the total of four hundred million is needed for the RTA District, but very possibly two hundred million of that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien, for what purpose do you arise?"

O'Brien: "Point of information. How long does the Speaker have and is he addressing his remarks to the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "I believe it's ten minutes.."

O'Brien: "And he's addressing his remarks to the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the motion, Representative Daniels. Proceed."

Daniels: "Combine now, we discover that of that four hundred million dollars, two hundred million can in fact be earmarked to downstate Illinois. Now we have been advised by the Director of Transportation that he intends to earmark two hundred million dollars of the series A bonds and coincidentally, a proposal that had been made by the suburban collar county Members in addressing this subject to the Governor two days ago. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the hour of 7:10 p.m. on this evening we were given Mayor Byrne and Governor Thompson's proposal for the funding of RTA and for the funding of the Department of Transportation. In that proposal are the items just discussed with you. Those of us who are opposing the sales tax, not merely because it's a new tax, not merely because we believe that the people of the State of Illinois are demanding a more efficient operation of government and not merely because we believe in our own mind that we are violating the basic campaign promises that we were elected upon during the last Session. We tell you right now that in the four hundred million dollars available in general revenue, it's not unreasonable to expect that a part of this can be spent in the Department of Transportation or an RTA funding project. And we say to you



that we will fight this proposed sales tax increase upon your people, the people of Chicago, of one percent, we in the outlying suburban collar county area will help you in fighting that new tax to be imposed upon your people and the half cent to be imposed upon upon our people in DuPage County and a quarter percent in the other counties. And we're asking the downstaters, we're asking the people of downstate Illinois to stick with us on this. A state divided, a state that's being divided by our Governor and our Mayor, to be a state that fights between itself, between downstate, upstate, and collar county areas is no good. The very division itself that's inherent in this program, that causes all of us to fear that we will have a tax imposed upon us without our representation because we don't have the downstate votes or the Chicago votes. It's inherently unfair and unreasonable. And we say to you that we have a commitment to mass transportation. We have a commitment to proper funding of roads in the State of Illinois and for those of you that have been working with us for the last week, you know we have delivered to you a series of proposals, of proposals that are fair, that downstate Illinois, central Illinois, collar counties, Cook County, Illinois and the city of Chicago that imposes no new tax, no sales tax upon your people and that has a minimal drain on the general revenue fund. The motion before you now is a motion to strike the enacting clause of this legislation. If this motion were to prevail, it would have the effect of killing this legislation so that it would not be used as a vehicle for this most unfair tax. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

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

Jaffe: "Yeah, a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is a



motion to strike the enacting clause relevant at this time when we're on a nonconcurrency? It would seem to me that if you could say at this time that we can have a motion to strike the enacting clause, then you can do it on Third Reading. You can do it on First Reading. You can do it almost at any other time. That's not been the procedure of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me that it has been the procedure of the House and the Rules Committee refused to delete that on the floor. The House floor refused to delete that provision from the rules. So it is in order. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Is that debatable, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll look that up."

Jaffe: "What are the rules with regard to, you know, ..It would seem to me that we're at a point..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now. You asked a question and the Parliamentarian is consulting Robert's Rules of Order. Supplemental Calendar is being passed out now. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, while the Parliamentarian is getting an answer to the question I just, for the record, this Bill .. the Gentleman started speaking at 10:30. It's 10:20... 10:32... 10:42 now. He has spoke ten minutes on a nondebatable motion and I believe in order to save the time of the House and have the ability to have the Conference Committee to meet if they are going to be meeting, and hopefully to be back here by midnight, we should proceed on House Bill 2348 with his motion up or down and I believe he's already used his ten minutes on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what.. state your point."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, Mr.

Speaker and Representative Lechowicz is one of our leaders



and I think he has helped to write the rules as all of us have. And I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, because I, too, have filed that motion and maybe we've had some second thoughts about filing that motion. Because we've had some second thoughts about that all of us who filed it, both myself, Representative Lee Daniels and Jack Davis have the right and no person can take that right away from me. No person can take that right away from Jack Davis. No person can take that right away from Lee Daniels. We have that right because we're Members of this Gen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Matijevich: "We have that right because the electors in my district sent me here. They sent me here. They sent you here, Representative Lechowicz. I have a right to represent the people in my district. I have a right to represent the people in the State of Illinois by the seat I hold right here. And I won't let anybody, let it be a leader of this House, let it be the Governor, let it be the Mayor of the city of Chicago, let it be anybody, to take that right away from me. And I'm going to have my ten minutes too as one who filed this motion I raise the point of ..."

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

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I don't even know what point the Gentleman is addressing. It seems to me I asked a question, wanted to go on for two seconds, and you shut my mike off. You turned on his mike and he's talking I don't know on what."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I didn't shut your mic off."

Jaffe: "Well, I still would like to know what point the Gentleman is addressing.."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "My point of order was that the Assistant Majority



Leader was out of order when he foreclosed the right of Representative Lee Daniels to explain himself on his motion and I also have.. am a .."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, all I pointed out was that the Gentleman used ten minutes of time on the floor to explain a nondebatable motion. I did question the fact, but I just want to point out for the record he did use his ten minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the only thing is unfortunately I didn't start the timer because I didn't expect him to talk that long. I will do it. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, that's my point. When Representative Daniels got up to speak, about five minutes through his speech, I asked the Chair how much time he had. You indicated ten minutes at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "That's right."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, we came back from our Conference Committee at 8:30. From 8:30 until 10:30 before we took this measure up we diddled around and didn't even take appropriation measures. This is one of the most important Bills and one of the most important issues facing the State of Illinois. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's your job and your responsibility in that Chair to see to it that we do not have a filibuster that goes after twelve o'clock that will preclude the passage of any positive transportation package for the people of the State of Illinois, Mr. Speaker. And I think that you're part of that package right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Speaker, somebody made a Parliamentary inquiry whether this motion was debatable and we're waiting. The Assistant Majority Leader apparently assumes that it is nondebatable, but I haven't heard



the ruling from the Parliamentarian. I was always under the impression that this is debatable. Would you please have a ruling?"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait minute now. I'm trying to get a ruling from the Parliamentarian. Is it debatable? Is it debatable? Is it debatable? He advises me that it is debatable. Now I have put on about one.. thirty seconds for you, Representative Daniels. I think you have gone pretty long and I will put on the ten minutes for everybody else. Now, Representative Daniels conclude. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Point of order. Will each and every other Sponsor of this Amendment be allowed ten minutes to talk on this motion or will all .. It's one motion and one Amendment. There should be only one Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Member according to our rules.. any Member has ten minutes. Now, there's no way that I know that I can suppress the right of the Members. Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak on this motion. But first of all, I'd like to yield..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait minute. We had Representative Leinenweber. Are you finished Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "Well, I was going to also point out that I very clearly noticed that Representative Daniels was interrupted at about ten thirty seven. So he has at least three minutes more to go."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to yield my ten minutes to Mr. Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "No, you can't.. That is not yieldable. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "You work too."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on the point of order that



was raised concerning the.. whether or not this motion is dilatory or whether it's proper or not. Back in 1975 when the last time it was used successfully when I presented a motion that struck the enacting clause from the Democratic remap we had the topic researched. And through the years of history, the Illinois House it has been used at various stages on Second Reading, Third Reading and on Conference Committee reports. So Representative Daniels's motion is a motion that is in order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you may as well put the ten minute timer on because I expect to use my ten minutes in speaking in support of the motion by the Gentleman from DuPage."

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

Conti: "You told me he had thirty seconds left. He has 3 minutes left. He hasn't had his 3 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay now. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to yield my time to Representative Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "We already decided that you can't yield. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's not yieldable. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I am not trying to yield to anyone. I'm trying to get ten minutes to discuss the reason why I am in support of the Gentleman's motion as it is now presently before the House. And if Representative Daniels would just hold off for a second, I would like to take those ten minutes to show to the Members of the House that sometimes Members who are elected to



this Body have affected the future of major issues of legislation by taking the time and using it wisely by trying to argue with their fellow Members in trying to use the judicious approach to serious legislation. I recall vividly that passage of the Income Tax Act in 1969 where it took only a few Members, four or five Members, to take it upon themselves to filibuster this House to a standstill long enough to change an agreement between the Mayor of the city of Chicago and the Governor of this State, at that time Richard Ogilvie. It took only three or four Members with enough intestinal fortitude to say to the people of Illinois and to their colleagues that they didn't want a standstill and see corporations and individuals taxed at the same rate. And one of those Members.. Two of those Members are still here with us and I could tell you that if it's going to take another filibuster under a new Constitutional guidelines and under new rules of this House in 1979, there are enough Members to join with those who are in opposition to this railroad.. this Bill that will be tried to be railroaded through this House by the Governor and by the Mayor of this city, that there's enough Members in here with enough intestinal fortitude to stop any kind of action in that manner. I suggest to the Members of the House, that they should seriously think of supporting this motion only if for no other reason but to take this railroad train and take it off its track. This train should not run through this House tonight. I think that we are intelligent enough Legislators here that we could take the time over the summer to reason with our community, to try to get some understanding in our communities and just what is necessary in the area of a transportation long range program?.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, for what purpose



do you arise?"

Friedrich: "I believe.. I don't believe he's discussing the motion. He's discussing the road program and that's not an issue before us. The issue is whether or not to strike the enacting clause."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. Representative Friedrich is correct. Now Representative Ryan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "We'll have to.. We'll have to let Hanahan continue and then I'll put that question. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, some people get awfully nervous about hearing the truth. And I am going to speak about the motion to strike the enacting clause in my justification of support of that motion. Any Member in their right mind would support it, unless they are bought up by a Governor or somebody else who has something to offer. Now let's stop kidding ourselves. The reason why you should support this motion is because you'll derail that railroad train that's going to be coming through this House in a few minutes. I served here when this RTA was passed into law and I said at that time that many Members from downstate will be ripped off in the future. Now there's a few that are understanding this, that when the money is socked into Pikarsky's-70 some thousand dollar a year pension for not doing anything, that it's coming from downstate Illinois like it's coming from all the rest of the state. So now there's Members here who are willing to say, 'Hey, let's take a better look at the program as presented.' And in support of this motion, we should stand pat, support the motion to strike the enacting clause..."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, there's nothing in this Bill that



says anything about the RTA and I wish you'd make him stick to the subject."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Speak to the subject, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I'm sticking as best as I could. It's pretty hard to stay, you know, calm and cool to a subject that means so much to the millions of people in Illinois that are being ripped off with these kinds of programs. I support concepts that sometimes a lot of people wonder about in mass transit and that don't apply to my area, but in this.. support of this motion, it certainly has to be taken into consideration that the program that's trying to be shoved down elected officials and how many of you stand proudly for the test of election and stand proudly in front of your family and friends and say how proud you are to use your decision making powers, your brain, your heart, your feelings in order to pass legislation into law? And now at this time, one man and one woman are going to dictate to the people of Illinois their future of transportation unless in three or four hours that we are to buy this pig in a poke and be stuck with it and put this binding and all the rest of them, our children and our grandchildren, I think we have to support the motion to strike the enacting clause if for no other reason but to have.. to allow us to have the time... to allow us to have the time over the next couple of months to find out where Illinois is going to be in this energy crisis, to find out our real needs relative to highway problems in this state, to find out how far gasoline prices are going to go and to find out if there's a better method of supporting mass transportation than the regressive form of a sales tax that hits at the poorest of the poor people, the ones that you should be standing up here protecting. Somebody here is advising that we should tax



them. And not only tax them on articles that are of luxury nature, but tax them on food and on clothing and on medicine and all the other necessities of life. Even tax them when they get a welfare check and go to buy some food with that welfare check. Tax them for an RTA or mass transit. That's foolish to subsidize the commuters who are making twice the amount of money of those who don't use the commuter railroad trains and subsidize them so they can sit on the railroad train and smoke their pipe and ride on the 9:05 into Chicago to earn a high priced living. I think we have to really take the time now to support this motion to strike the enacting clause, put this whole House in order, allow reasonable people to meet under reasonable conditions and not under the hectic worry of the last minute on June 30th of 1979, to sit down and reason out where Illinois is going to fit in in the future of energy and the energy crunch. I say to you that while we're sitting here debating tonight, and worrying about how we're going to get home tomorrow if gas stations close all over the state, then you're going to have a hell of a lot more to worry about by the month of September. It maybe the best purpose I have ever served in the Illinois General Assembly if we could stop this railroad train from shooting through this House tonight. So that in the month of August or September, we'll know exactly where we are in energy and until then, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have to stop this railroad train. We can't be railroaded by a Governor with his promises and let me tell you something, 15 years of service in this House, I've heard it from Republicans; I've heard it from Democrats and let me tell you something, you can't take all those promises and show me an ounce of concrete that really was delivered by any of them because you and I know



you and I know very well they're empty promises, that the roads will be built because the engineers say they need them, that the EPA says they're allowed, and mass transit will be funded because the people are there. You're not going to hoodwinked by some guy or some woman offering you a project. Then not support this motion. We have to support this motion and stop this railroad train right now. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels, I guess I cut 30 seconds off. You've got 30 seconds. Representative Daniels, the sponsor of the motion."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, you said at one time that I had 3 minutes. Now do I have..."

Speaker Redmond: "Three seconds.. 30 seconds."

Daniels: "Thirty seconds. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You told me you would move.. put my motion after the Gentleman that just spoke finished. He finished, Mr. Speaker. It's time to put the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "I think.. I think if you wait a few minutes.. a few seconds, you'll be satisfied. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "I think that Representative Macdonald gave me her ten minutes anyhow if.."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, .."

Daniels: "If I collect enough, I could speak all night long, I think. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unfortunately when I only had a few remarks left to go, I was interrupted in what I was saying earlier. And what it amounts to is the fact that we have worked extremely hard in an effort to give the House of Representatives and the Senate a positive program, positive in funding nature. Those of you that have had an opportunity to review that program know that it's a program that can work. What



we're suggesting to you is stop this unnecessary imposition of a tax on our people. Help us. Help us so we can continue in the spirit of one state, one state unique in this country, one state, agricultural and one state urban in nature. And Mr. Speaker, I have such confidence that this House will make the right decision on that very crucial issue and because I have been asked by many people in this House not to place them in the embarrassing position of voting on a motion to strike an enacting clause. on a respected Member of this House, Representative Winchester, I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, that you withdraw my name from that motion. I'm asking that the work of the House go forward and that if the Conference Committee report comes forward with the program that we fear the most, the program advocated for a new tax on our people, that each and every one of you in this House give this your best consideration and remember how unfairly a portion of this state will be treated if that tax is imposed on us. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw my name from that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw his name from the motion? Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "You mean leave to withdraw his name? That leaves two more names. I'll give him leave to withdraw his, but there's two more names left."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, does Representative Daniels have leave to withdraw? "

Matijeich: "I'll wait a minute then.."

Speaker Redmond: "If there's no objection, leave is granted. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, often we accuse our Governor of not showing leadership and not moving ahead. Here he has shown leadership with the Mayor. And why? Because this Body has failed



to come up with a transportation program or a program to save the RTA. We have psychopaths in this House who hate mass transportation, who hate public transportation, who act childishly in fighting the concept of regional transportation authority. Those psychopaths will never agree to any kind of funding of mass transportation; will never agree to any highway programs. Of course the Governor and the Mayor had to come forward because this Body failed, failed utterly in its responsibility. Now, I'm not saying I agree or disagree with the Mayor and the Governor's program. At least they have a program. This House has failed to come forward with..."

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

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, you know what I rise for. I had a motion that I was promised to be called after Representative Hanahan. Then after Representative Daniels. I persist in that motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan has moved the previous question. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker.. We'll get some Roll Calls later tonight I'm sure. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we've heard others speak on the floor and I don't think I'm a psychopath, by the way, Representative Pierce. I voted for RTA you know. And.. And originally... Now, that's the problem. When you use the term and then everybody might get under the umbrella. Now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the floor of this House, we've allowed some Members who have not made the motion to speak ten minutes. And I feel as a personal privilege, as a personal privilege, that I have than right, Mr. Speaker, because my name is on that motion. And I have a right to explain both to the Sponsor and to every Member of the floor of the



House why I'm going to take the action that I'm going to take, Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House.

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was a part of what has been a number of task force in the Democratic party on major issues in this current Session of the Legislature. And when anybody stands on this floor and says that we weren't going anywhere we all know that many of the crucial issues of the Session... Representative Schneider has.."

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

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, we were on the order of psychopaths when Representative Pierce was interrupted. I wonder if he can finish his comments."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Chair made a mistake. Representative Ryan's motion should have been put. I had no reason to know what Representative Pierce was rising for. And I think in fairness to Representative Ryan that he's entitled to put that to the question. 'Shall the previous question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 'aye' and 87 'no'. The motion fails. Representative Dawson, for what purpose do you arise? Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Governor Thompson has shown leadership here tonight and so has Mayor Byrne and I wish you'd show a little bit by getting this House in order for us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I said, there were task force working on the area of transportation and many of you know that in many Sessions of the Legislature we work and work and



work and we often conclude by a reasonable package.

And I thought..."

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

Skinner: "There are unauthorized people on the floor and I wish you would ask them to get off the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "All unauthorized persons off the floor. That includes all the staff, all the visitors. Only Members on the floor. All unauthorized persons off the floor. Unauthorized persons off the floor. Proceed, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was proceeding to tell you that much was being done on the area of transportation and all of sudden we were laid with a bombshell that we had to do this or nothing, that it ought to be the package that is going to have the name of Thompson and Byrne or nothing would prevail. Now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I haven't spent... I haven't slept practically all week because I have know what they've been trying to do. And I remember when I heard the first inaugural speech of Governor Thompson where he said that he is not going to split this state, that there will not be a Chicago and there will not be a downstate Illinois, that there will not be a suburban area, that there will not be the collar counties, that we will all be one Illinois. And I think that's very crucial to the issue tonight. Because the issue that we have tonight, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is two powerful people in the State of Illinois trying to split two great political parties, two great political parties and I believe strongly..."

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



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we're on a motion; to table 23...

House Bill 2348. There is nothing in this about

what the Gentleman is speaking about and I wish you'd make him confine himself to the subject."

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

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Let me point out to the Gentleman from downstate that a whole subject of what this is about is because what this Bill is about is not what it is about. And we ought to waive the rule that requires a Member to speak about what this is about because what they're trying to do and what Representative Matijevich is trying to point out is that what's going to happen on 2348 has nothing to do with what 2348 is about and so the Member ought to be able to talk about what's going to happen to us and happen to the taxpayers of this state and this region and I think we ought to let the Gentleman talk on what's going to happen to us. Proceed."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted that this is one Illinois and here we are sitting in this General Assembly in this great House that all of us revere so much. All of you know how dear the legislative process is to me. When I speak in behalf of the legislative process, I speak up for Democrats and Republicans. I believe strongly in the separation of powers. And, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I tell you that what we have before us is an attempt to use the A part of the State of Illinois to try to get that part of the State of Illinois to finance a huge program. At a time of the year, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the heels of an

advisory referendum where the people of the State of Illinois in overwhelming numbers, the people said that we ought to have a lid on spending, where the people of the State of Illinois look to us as their elected leaders throughout Illinois and say to us, 'We've had enough. We can't.. We can't spend \$100.00 in the grocery store and get much more than one bag of groceries. That's about all we can get. We can't go to a gas station now and fill our tanks without practically a \$20.00 bill disappearing.' And the prospects look like it will rise. And these people are telling me and I know that they're telling all of you that sit on both sides of the aisle that you had better not do something drastic that is again going to dig deeply in their pockets. And Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was sick, too, because I found my party and what I thought was in a good burst of responsibility, try to do something to help poor people. And if they were sincere about that, I can't believe that my party would offer an increase in the sales tax at the same time, in the same week, when they were saying we should exempt food and drugs. If they do... If they didn't mean it, they surely can't mean it today. So, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all this week I've been meeting... I've been meeting with people from all over the State of Illinois on what I thought could be something reasonable about transportation. In all those groups, I said I think that we can come out with something that's this area of the state and that area of the state, Chicago, the suburbs, Cook County and the collar counties, and downstate where we can spread our responsibility, spread our obligations. I don't think that any of us believe that we should put one end of the state against the other. That, I think,



would be tragically irresponsible. I've found myself this week working with people who I never worked with before. In fact, I said to those who I was working with this week that this may be a new day, this may be a new day in the General Assembly where we will find Democrats working with Republicans working in bi-partisan type of task force, that we will look at the problems in a bi-partisan spirit and say to everybody, 'Come on in. Come on in downstaters. Come on in collar county, suburban, Democrat or Republican, or who you may be in Chicago, Democrat and Republican, who you may be. Come along all of you together.' No longer should one voice or two voices in the State of Illinois determine what direction that the monies of the people of the State of Illinois, the taxpayers, if their monies are being used for. And I'll tell you it has been frustrating for me, very frustrating for me, but at least back in my mind I've said to myself, I don't know what will come out of this. But I see something bright in the future out of this because I see people getting together now that never got together before and I see that the future could hold something promising for us as Legislators, that we can work together, no matter what area of the State of Illinois that we come from. I guess I've got four more minutes. John Cordon said that I've got four more minutes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I speak mostly though for those who aren't here and those who are represented in the gallery and taxpayers who sometimes wonder what we're doing here and whether we really know what we're doing. And sometimes I sit on this floor of the House and wonder if I know what I'm doing. Because I've been in that posture too in past years where I thought I was sitting here being very, very responsible and then



all of a sudden as we use that expression and I've hear it used today, the train went by. And you're either on it or you weren't on it. And after it went by you and you didn't even hear the whistle and you found out when you went home and the General Assembly adjourned what was on that train. And it was ordinarily a train full of a bag of goodies and you paid the price for those goodies, but there was nothing on that train for you. And so I think, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that it's most important for all of us to understand that the train ought to come by for everybody, that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Your time is up, Representative Matijevich. One second."

Matijevich: "I'll close by saying that I've never used the matter of a motion to strike the enacting clause but I was desperate and I wanted to tell Bob Winchester, a good friend of mine, he knows the emotion and why I did this, but I now ask leave that my name be stricken from that motion to strike the enacting clause but I'll fight just as hard to beat this terrible package."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have his name withdrawn? Representative Jaffe." Representative Jaffe objects. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a Co-hyphenated Sponsor of this very serious motion to strike the enacting clause. And I believe that I, too, should be allotted my fair share of time in debate to explain to you what my motives were for taking this very serious step that the Ladies and Gentlemen in the gallery and the press know and our Members... other Members know is a very rare..."

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

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, you know, I think we're in the midst



of a filibuster. I just objected to Representative Matijevich having his name removed from this particular motion. I think Representative Davis is going to go through the same filibuster and then he's going to move that his name be taken off the motion. I just want to tell you in this that I object to that, too, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Matijevich did not have his name withdrawn. There were objections raised. Mr. Speaker, but I'm a hyphenated Co-Sponsor of this motion to strike. And I believe that it's every Member's right on this floor, Representative, on this floor, I was elected from the same number of constituents that you were. And I have the right to stand here and talk for the constituents of the 42nd District and explain their wishes to this General Assembly. The 42nd District that was once represented by the man that gave you RTA, yes, the man that was my predecessor, who lives five miles from me, who gave you RTA, and suffered the political consequences for that. I, too, am involved in this fight to strike this enacting clause and when I was rudely interrupted I was about to tell my good friend and colleague and practically seatmate who sits in front of me that I do not relish this, Representative. I do not relish this motion. It's a serious motion. It's one that kills a brother, a colleague, legislation that he has fought for six months to reach this point in time. But it's one that I think he's been misguided, Ladies and Gentlemen, misguided into becoming the engine on that train that Representative Hanahan and Representative Matijevich in their metaphors alluded to, that train that was rolling on the track to run over the citizens of Chiaago, the citizens of suburbia, the citizens most



of downstate and of the collar counties. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, that train was on the track and it may tonight right here at this very moment while we're debating this motion, may still be on the track in some unknown way, some mysterious way that the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor have devised to keep that train on the track so that they can bring to the citizens of Chicago and the citizens of suburbia and the collar counties and downstate a disproportionate program that benefits no one in the state, Ladies and Gentlemen, no one in the state unless you assume, of course, that a massive eight billion dollar road program is absolutely necessary for the State of Illinois in an hour when gas can't even be bought in Springfield or on the expressways in the state on Sunday and when gas rationing is no more than a year or two away in this country and that all of us who negotiated the counter proposal which was totally ignored, totally ignored as a viable alternative to the quote 'Byrne-Thompson' proposal- was totally ignored. All of us a bi-partisan Committee of downstate, downstate's Representative Mautino, Representative Dunn, Representative Bradley was in the negotiations. Representative Donovan, Representative Matijevich, Representative Jack Davis, Representative Lee Daniels, Representative Leinenweber and Schneider on a bi-partisan effort to produce equity for this state for every geographical area so that no one, no one, in the state will be left out. No one will be left out. And most of all, Ladies and Gentlemen, think about what happened here only a few days ago, only a few days ago when 100 votes passed, passed the sales tax exemption on food and medicine for the citizens of Illinois. Think about it. I didn't vote for it because I thought that was fiscally irresponsible. But I'm saying to you



Members, particularly of the city of Chicago both Republican and Democrat, those of you who voted for it, how can you go home, how can you go home and say to the people, 'We have given you relief on food and medicine, but we put one cent sales tax on everything else so that other people can ride the mass transit system'? Those negotiating the counter proposal which was ignored, which was never brought to light, which was never, never discussed as an alternative, those people are committed to mass transit..."

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

Matijevich: "Point of inquiry. I just want to make the point and we'll get back to Davis, but there's nothing on my desk, no Conference Committee report, relating to the subject of mass transportation, public transportation on my desk and it's.. and it's beyond the one hour before 12:00 o'clock. I just want to make that point right now and if anybody disputes that I want to know about it. So I just want that in the record, that at this hour there's nothing on my desk relating to any Conference Committee report on transportation and it is now 11:22. And I'd like anybody in a position of authority to say if there's one on anybody's desk. I'd like to know about it, but I see none. So I want that written into the record. Continue, Jack."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis, continue."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I get somewhat emotional I suppose since Tuesday that team has been negotiating. Many of us have had little sleep. We feel so deeply about this. We've come up with a counter proposal to the Byrne-Thompson proposal that does not... that does not raise any taxes on sales in this state or in any area of the state. We've come up with a program that gives equity to downstate by guaranteeing the down-



state their road program will be equitable. We've come up with a program that guarantees that equity will be brought to all areas of this state and still provide the provisions basically in Byrne-Thompson. It was called fiscally irresponsible so we went back and re-worked it. And now we've come out with one that has very little or no impact on the general revenue fund, which was the basis for the antagonism to our proposal, which was ignored, ignored. And Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but I must say to you that there was another Davis in this House. Only recently the Grand Deacon Davis. I, too, am a deacon in my church so maybe deacon Davis is revisited here tonight. But I feel as strongly about this proposal as deacon Davis felt about civil rights legislation and fought so hard in this House for civil rights legislation. Don't let that train roll over us. Don't let that train..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis, your time is up. Bring your remarks to a close. Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left?"

Speaker Redmond: "Your time has expired. Just close and speak in short words."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for the indulgence of time. I appreciate it. I did have a prayer from deacon Davis and from me that I wanted to read to you."

Speaker Redmond: "No. No."

Davis: "But I will not do that now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Schlickman, do you seek recognition? Representative Davis?"

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, at this time I would request that my name also be withdrawn from the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, you know, striking the enacting clause is a very serious remedy and quite truthfully I don't



know if I would be for the Thompson-Byrne package, but I must tell you that I sort of resent the Members who have stood in this position beforehand and talked about this particular thing when in fact they didn't even want to go forward. We have to fund the agencies of State Government. We have a number of Bills on the Calendar which must be passed on before 12:00 midnight tonight and I think that this has been an imposition on the Members of the House and I would move that.. I would object to Representative Davis having his name striken. I don't think that he can get out whole after holding this House up for this long a time."

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

Vinson: "I move to table the motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You do what?"

Vinson: "I move to table the motion to strike the enacting clause."

Speaker Redmond: "That is in order and it is not debatable.

It's not debatable. All those in favor of the motion to table.. not debatable. All those in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Roll Call has been required.. requested. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. There's a motion to table. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like a minute to take to explain my vote. "

Speaker Redmond: "One minute."

Hanahan: "I have never really figured out how I'm voting yet, John. Nobody from the Governor's Office told me yet. Nobody else instructed me how to use my mind. I'm sure there's elected officials here tonight who were very proud to get elected to use their mind and there's sincerity to get elected when they took their oath of office to say how they were going to act. I



sure hope that those Members at this time are using their best judgment, in voting 'no' so that we can consider this very judiciously down the road and through the summer months and know where we're going. So I am going to ask and explain my vote by saying that I suggest a red vote would be a good vote and if this should lose, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

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

Bowman: "No, I don't want to explain my vote. I want to have an inquiry of the Chair. I thought the motion to strike the enacting clause took precedence over all other motions. Now is the motion to table the motion to strike the enacting clause in order?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's in order. Anything further on this question? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I wanted to explain my vote. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond "One minute."

Leinenweber: "And Members of the House, a few months ago when we sat and adopted these rules, we very.. as I recall we struck out the provision for both the motion and for an Amendment to strikethe enacting clause. And this House decided in its wisdom by a Majority vote that that was a good provision. A motion to strike the enacting clause was added by Amendment to our rules and I think that was proper and I think this is a good motion that we ought to consider and vote on this motion and save this House a great deal of time if we have the votes to strike the enacting clause. Mr. Speaker, I think it's a good motion and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's motion to table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would question the Chair on



your ruling. On.. this is Rule 61. It says 'precedence of motions; B; the following motions shall have precedence in the order in which they are named, number two; a motion to strike the enacting clause of a Bill has precedence over a motion amended.' Now, would you ask the Parliamentarian to rule on that? It's 61B, point two, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "In explaining my 'no' vote and urging more 'no' votes, I would like to say that what we're doing tonight is we're being a very deliberative Body. We have a choice between waiting until the late evening hours to have perhaps the Governor or the Mayor of a large city or someone else railroad through a proposal that most of us have never seen. Those of us who are voting 'no' favor the Committee process. We would rather have the people of Illinois be able to watch us hold Committee hearings, deliberate very carefully on these matters. Late at night is no time to be railroaded into something. We should be calm. We should be patient. We should recognize that tomorrow is coming and the next day. We'll be back in Springfield in the fall. That will be a time when we can have a Special Session concurrent with our Veto Session if necessary to consider these weighty matters. I have pages and pages of matters relating to the funding of highways, the RTA. This is too complex to consider and that is the reason the people of Ill.. of the State of Illinois must recognize that we are voting 'no' at this time in order that our discussion will not be forestalled and so that when we do arrive in another half hour on the next day, the Constitution of the State of Illinois provides that then the Minority will be protected. Then all parts of the State of Illinois whether you be in the city of Chiaago, whether you be



in the suburbs, whether you be downstate, then you will have a right to veto anything that is really not going to be in the public interest to your people because the Constitution was designed to protect the Minority after June 30th so that an extraordinary Majority of three-fifths will be required in another 30 minutes. And that's what we're doing. That's why we're going a little slow because we want to respect the Minority. We want to get over in the next day when the Minority will have to be considered in anything we put together. And it's for the Minority rights of the people of the State of Illinois, of every part of our state, that we are going slow. And I hope the people in the press and everyone who is watching what appears to be a circus, what appears to be a carnival, but is really a very careful deliberate move on our parts to protect the Minority of the people in this great state and I urge more 'no' votes. I think a 'no' vote is responsible at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. Pierce. Pierce. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentlemen... The Gentlemen who are filibustering tonight have no program for regional transportation. They're out to destroy it. The people that have spoken here most of them would destroy mass transportation. The people in my district are at gas lines. They realize we need public transportation. Where were your Bills in Committee? Where was the last speaker's Bills in Committee that would have helped the RTA, that would have helped public transportation? He had no Bills because he's out to destroy it. He's been out to destroy it since 1974 when it was first passed and many of these men on the floor are hypocrites. They're phonies. They're out to destroy RTA. They don't believe in public transporta-



tion. They drive big cars. They want automobiles on the highway burning up..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell, one minute to explain your vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I should rise on a point of personal privilege since my name was mentioned in debate, but I won't. I will say that I've enjoyed this great show tremendously and I think it's.. I think what we really need is to have an intermission so that the Directors could put on act II. But, in the meantime, I think those of us who want to explain our vote and say let's try to be responsible, we know that if we don't do something about passing this Bill now, we'll all be here this summer, next fall and we will, indeed, be in a continuous Session. Mr. Speaker, either we must move ahead or else we may as well adjourn or at least have an intermission before we go into act II. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker. What Majority is needed for this motion to pass?"

Speaker Redmond: "Simple Majority. Representative Satterthwaite, simple Majority."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, may I then explain my 'no' vote on this measure? The public may only know of one proposal that went out in the media as a Thompson-Byrne proposal. Those of us who have been here in the Legislature have had the Thompson-Byrne proposal one and two and modifications. We've had proposals by various Members of the Legislature. None of us have had sufficient time within the last few days to adequately address those proposals. I think it's folly for us to continue now with something that we will regret later and I urge more 'no' votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record. On this question there's



87 'aye', 82 'no'. Representative Walsh, for what purpose do you arise?"

Walsh: "Well, I rise, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted to explain my vote. But since you didn't recognize me for that, I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I had already requested that verification of this Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "I have announced that it's 87-82. Representative Walsh has requested a verification. I think before we get into that with your permission I would like to recognize Representative Friedrich. Representative Friedrich?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of other business in addition to this and out of respect to those people who have other Bills on Conference Committee reports, I would like to move at this time that we suspend Rule 68-E which has to do with the reporting of Conference Committees and I would move that that be suspended."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Hear the motion. Give the Gentleman courtesy. Proceed."

Friedrich: "Let me remind you again, this effects a lot of things besides the thing.. this road thing we're talking about. So I move that this rule, 68-E, be suspended for 24 hours until July the 1st."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, what order of business are we on? I know we were on a verification...."

Speaker Redmond: "I recognized Representative Friedrich because it's a very urgent matter as far as Conference Committee reports. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm not prepared to totally object to the Gentleman's motion, but I would like for him to repeat it once again and I'd like for him to explain it. Mr. Speaker?"



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bullock: "The Gentleman repeat the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will you repeat the motion, Representative Friedrich?"

Friedrich: "Yes. If I can have a little order, I will."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "The motion is out of order. We're on a Roll Call. We're on a Roll Call right now and that's... and the point of order is that motion is out of order because we're on a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "I think the Gentleman's point of order.."

Matijevich: ".. I request for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "I think the Gentleman's point of order is well taken. You know, I just wanted to preserve all of the Conference Committee reports if that's the wish of the Members. The Concurrences ... that if we don't... If we don't do.. extend.. suspend that rule and extend the deadlines, the Conference Committee reports can not be considered after midnight. Now all the.. all the.. Many of the appropriation Bills and many Bills that are necessary to the operation of State Government are contained in that motion. Now if that's the wish.. If that's the wish of the Body, why it's alright with me. Representative Walsh has requested a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. Is the motion to strike the enacting clause still before the Body in light of the fact that the three Sponsors of the motion have withdrawn their names and therefore, Mr. Speaker, the motion no longer has any standing?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully disagree with the Majority Leader. Objections were raised to the withdrawal of the motion and the name."



Speaker Redmond: "The question has been raised. What's your decision? According to Rule 60.. Wait a minute now. Wait a minute now. According to Rule 60-C it states that once a motion has been stated by the Speaker, read aloud, maybe withdrawn only by leave of the House. Now Representative Davis asked leave to withdraw his name as a Sponsor. Representative Jaffe and others objected. So under that circumstance, Representative Davis should have asked for ... moved that he be permitted and take a Roll Call. Having failed to do that, then he.. then he was not withdrawn and the motion was still pending. So under those circumstances, it would appear to me that the motion was in order. Now Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. Mr. Speaker and your Parliamentarian, if I might, Representative Friedrich put a motion to the Chair and those of us who are very, very concerned over this Bill and the apparent vehicle that's coming down the tubes, Senate Bill 1072, we want to ask an inquiry of the Chair as to how we can preserve the Conference Committee reports that are on the table now so that you can act on those. But we are concerned over the vehicles on transportation and we have no desire to kill those. If Representative Pierce wants to kill them, that's his business. But we have no desire to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you state your question again? You want to know how you can consider the Conference Committee reports that are on your desk at the present time?"

Daniels: "At the present time."

Speaker Redmond "Only by suspending the rule which is what Representative Friedrich's motion was."

Daniels: "Alright. Does that involve the possibility of Senate Bill 1072 which is not before us yet, which is the apparent vehicle that is going to be used now for



the Governor's program if it isn't on the desk?"

Speaker Redmond: "The motion to suspend the rule by one day.. the deadline rules with respect to Conference Committee reports. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I call to your attention Rule 61, precedence of motions. While a question is under debate, no motion may be entertained except and a number of motions..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I have ruled on that. And I went back. Yes, I have. Representative Matijevich raised a question and I said it was in order. And therefore, I didn't ... The point was in order so therefore I didn't persist in putting Representative Friedrich's motion because he was out of order at that time. Now I was proceeding for a verification of the Roll Call which is on the Board. If people will be quiet and sit down, we will proceed with that. Representative, I think that this procedure is dilatory at this time so we'll proceed with the verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Please sit down."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bower..."

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

Schlickman: "To suggest that the Chair invoke Hanahan's Rule and request every Member of this House...."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Every Member sit down in your own seat. When your name is called, respond. Representative Wikoff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was off the floor. May I be voted 'yes'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded 'yes'? Proceed with the verifi... We'll get back to that after the verification. And I think that you're dilatory in these matters. Proceed. Everybody sit



down in their own seat. Representative Walsh, sit down. Sandquist... you sit down. Mahar sit down. Huskey sit down. Campbell sit down. I'm not going to recognize anybody until this verification is finished unless you tell me the House is on fire. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

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

Bower. Bradley. Braun. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Collins. Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Ewing. Farley. Dwight Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallock. Henry. Hoxsey. Huff. Jaffe.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very important matter. And that there are people standing on that side of the aisle in that area and it's very difficult to see through them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones, Darrow, Mulcahey, Bullock, will you please sit down? And Hoffman, what are you doing over there? Hanahan's rules require that you be in your own seat. That's not Hoffman. Representative Hoffman, did you see what I thought? It was a back view and .. I apologize, Representative Hoffman. From the back you don't look like that big. Proceed."

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

I mean, poll of the affirmative. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Katz. Keane. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kulas.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes and Pierce and O'Brien, will you please sit down? Representative Hanahan can't see and that's his rule. Representative Hanahan was the one that complained. Proceed. "Representative Darrow 'aye'."

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



Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Broom (sic) please. McBroom, pardon me. I get you mixed up with the Director."

McBroom: "I know, Mr. Speaker, that you have trouble identifying me. Maybe when we know each other a little longer. Mr. Speaker, all I have to say is that I'm voting opposite from Representative Schlickman and some of these other Gentleman, but it seems when Representative Hanahan asks to enact Hanahan's Rules of order, they're enacted. Men are in their seats. I don't know how Houdini could verify here this evening. There's empty chairs. There's people wondering around the room. There's conferences to my left. There's conferences behind me. And I think Representative Schlickman and those who are so inclined deserve the same treatment that Representative Hanahan gets when he asks for his rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

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

Leon. Madigan. Marovitz. McAuliffe. McBroom.
McPike. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Peters.
Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Reilly. Rigney.
Robbins. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schuneman.
Simms. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl.
Swanstrom. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Vinson.
Watson. White. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Woodyard.
and Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the affirmative Roll Call? Representative Tuerk?"

Tuerk: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Tuerk recorded?"

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

Tuerk: "Gee, I wonder how that happened. Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Representative Wikoff."



Wikoff: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Wikoff: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is she recorded?"

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

Sumner: "Would you please make that a 'yes'?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that? Who? Representative Sumner desires to change from 'no' to 'aye', is that correct?"

Sumner: "Correct. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Gaines: "Change me and vote me 'aye' like Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Representative Leinenweber, are you seeking recognition? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does Representative Lechowicz have leave to be verified? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Bluthardt."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bluthardt: "Change me to 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Representative Richmond. Representative Richmond 'no'. Any questions? Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, could the Clerk indicate where we're at because there were so many changes here I don't know



now at what point we're at? How many votes are we staring with?"

Speaker Redmond: "93 'aye', 78 'no'."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I hate to ask some of the questions, but I'm going to have to. I know some Members, you know, are here, but they're not in their seats and I'm going to have to ask for their verification. Representative Braun."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun? She here? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her. Representative Braun has returned. Put her back on the Roll Call."

Hanahan: "Who?"

Speaker Redmond: "Braun."

Hanahan: "Where is she? Representative Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there with Representative Ryan. Representative Collins, you're not in your seat. Collins. There he is right there."

Hanahan: "Raise your hand. That's good. Thank you. Representative Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson is in his seat."

Hanahan: "No, he's not."

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

McPike: "Could I be verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike desires to be verified. Is that okay?"

Hanahan: "That's real official business I hope."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty, may he be verified? No objection. Be verified. Representative Friedrich. Representative Katz, what do you want?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Members of the House, if they refuse.. keep this up, in five more minutes every item of business in this House will be



tabled. Now..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would agree with what Representative Friedrich said. I don't believe the Members of the House realize the seriousness of what they're doing by not allowing the Representative from Centralia to put his motion. All these Bills and these boxes will die at midnight. I would ask that the verification be withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, point of information. Is there anything that keeps the House from accepting Mr. Friedrich's motion after midnight?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Because the rules say that at midnight everything is tabled. Now, if he can accept it after that, that's up to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman. Now, let's..."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, my question is, is there any reason why we cannot consider the matter of Conference Committees after midnight by calling the proper motion at that time?" Just take from the table. I don't think anybody needs to be upset, but I'd like to inquire of the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Redmond: "It has to be on the Calendar. It'll take 107 votes..."

Chapman: "One hundred and seven votes, nothing's ever dead in the General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyway, let's conclude on this .. Representative Matijevich interrupted me on a point of order before when we interrupted right in the middle of a Roll Call. 93 'aye' and 78 and Rep.. Where are we now?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm still. I've got..."

Speaker Redmond: "I know. Proceed."



Hanrahan: "Jesse White."

Speaker Redmond: "Jesse White? Representative White."

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

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified? Hearing no objection...
Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

White: "Mr. Speaker, in the interests of my district, I
would like to change from 'no' and I would rather have
my vote recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Represent-
ative Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, my light was not working. How am I
recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Rea: "Please leave me that way."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Chair.

About 35 minutes ago I asked a question of the Chair
in reference to a ruling. I have yet to personally
get a reference.. er a ruling out of the Parliamentarian
Epstein. I would think..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that was answered. I don't..."

Piel: "No, it was not, Mr. Speaker. I mean all I'm asking..."

Speaker Redmond: "Was not what?"

Piel: "It was not answered. I gave.. I asked for a ruling
on a motion. I mean, it's only fair. You know, I
asked for a ruling. I was not out of order asking for
the ruling and all I would like would be a ruling
from the Chair on 61B."

Speaker Redmond: "Represe... Representative Campbell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

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

Campbell: "That's fine. Leave it that way."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Flinn recorded?"

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

Flinn: "Well, change me to 'aye' then. I'm not going to stay on 'no' all night."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Sam Wolf?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Wolf: "Change me to 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Slape."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Slape recorded?"

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

Slape: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Vote me as 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye'. Representative Birchler."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I've been following... Mr. Speaker? I've been following your lead and I just can't take the tension any longer. So vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Harris: "Please change me to 'aye'."



Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Change me to 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Representative Pechous. Pechous."

Pechous: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Please change me to 'aye!'"

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'aye'. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, it's past midnight and this matter is no longer before us because it's on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is past twelve midnight now. We have not funded three-quarters of the state's budget. I believe that we have numerous Conference Committees that are now outstanding. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the status of those Conference Committees and also what is the status of the appropriation Bill now that we have not funded three-quarters of the state's budget, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe has poised a parliamentary inquiry and I'm asking the Parliamentarian. It's a very serious question and I'm asking the Parliamentarian to respond. Representative Hanahan doesn't know what day it is. Wait a minute now. Wait a minute now. Representative Jaffe has poised a question and I've asked the Parliamentarian to respond. Well, I.. We have time clock running so whatever I say doesn't make any difference. There's one on the tape there. I think that it's Sunday, the first of July at 12:05 a.m. Representative Jaffe has poised a Parliamentary inquiry. Parliamentarian, will you please respond?"

Parliamentarian Epstein: "Under Rule 68, the House Bills on the Order of Concurrence, on the Order of Nonconcurrence, and in Conference Committee which are those



Bills of which the House has possession of the Bills, are tabled as of midnight. The Senate Bills in any of those postures on which the House does not have possession of the Bills and which are in the Senate are not tabled under the House rules. The Senate rules may or may not, I'm not aware, have an impact and I don't know if any of their rules have been suspended."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Roll Call for attendance. Deputy Clerk will lead us in prayer. Representative Winchester, for what purpose do you arise?"

Winchester: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to find out what posture that House Bill 2348 is in."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll get back there. Did you get on the Roll Call? Representative Ropp, lead us in the pledge of allegiance."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to lead the prayer? Deputy Clerk, Leone, will lead the prayer."

Clerk Leone: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. God Bless the House of Representatives and all those who work and serve here. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "You want a permanent job? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, here we are in the first of July and we need our new monthly report on the invasion of Wisconsin. I want you to know that all is quiet on the western front, but there's hell here in Illinois. We've had a number of defections, but I want you to know that I captured my first POW. Senator Shapiro's daughter, who has been clandestinely working for the Supreme Court in Madison, showed up back here in Springfield today and I immediately took her into



custody. I will let her go when I can. I want you to know there's been a number of volunteers for the great army of the Republic and as soon as we can determine all of your qualifications, we'll notify you. At the present time we're having a number of problems with determining the proper means of determining sexuality. Colonel.. Everybody's quietly listening. Colonel Sue Catania has pointed out to me that we cannot offer dual type of facilities. And this is posing quite a problem in the tents and with this, General Kosinski has got his tanks rolling and he claims that they're the best make that can be produced in Poland. We have the only tanks in modern mechanization that have no treads. With this, Mr. Speaker, we will conclude hoping that we can take the Kansas cavalry shortly and convert Senator McPike to a good rational thought. If we cannot convert him to a good sound business atmosphere, he will be made the new First Commander of the great Illinois airforce kamikaze pilots."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we should remove Captain Kosinski. I heard that they were indeed septic tanks."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, you thoroughly ruined the opportunity I had because July the first is my birthday. So..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen... Representative Ebbesen, do you move for the suspension of Ebbesen's Rule?"

Ebbesen: "In this case, yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The rule is no singing 'Happy Birthday', but it's been suspended. Swanstrom. Representative Swanstrom. He's not through yet. Wait till... Wait till he gets through and then we'll really finish him."



Borchers: "I intended to be.. to remind you of my birthday and then say in honor of it, take the Roll Call. But I lost the chance because you beat me to the punch. That's all I have to say."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Swanstrom."

Swanstrom: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think everyone should join with me in singing 'Happy Birthday' to our distinguished colleague, Webber. Everybody ready? (song)"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am now reliably informed that Representative Webber Borchers is going to give all of us a gift, which will be the first time he's ever given anybody anything."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "The offer given by my Representative will be taken care of by him at his own expense. I appreciate his offer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in honor of Webber's birthday, I think he should give us all a gift. I make a motion that says we're not going to do anything to adjourn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, could it be that Representative Borchers's gift might be the gift of silence?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I move that all of the Bills in Conference Committee reports motion be put back on the Calendar in the same order that they were prior to midnight."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh".

Walsh: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker. The motion the Gentleman makes I would object to. What I would like to do is go over the Bills that are on the table that need be taken



from the table and are needed to fund State Government and get a pledge from the Sponsor of that Bill or those Bills that that Sponsor will not attach by Conference Committee, Concurrence or whatever anything dealing with the regional transportation authority or any of the matters over which we have been for the last hour and a half discussing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I've seen the light, Mr. Speaker, and I withdraw my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to address a very serious question I think that all Members of the General Assembly should be aware of. For the last two hours there's been a so-called Conference Committee addressing House Bill 1072.. excuse me, Senate Bill 1072, which has been the track on which the train was going to run. Members of that Conference Committee from the House that I know of, have been involved in that for two hours were John Dunn, myself, Senator Prescott Bloom. I take it as a personal affront and affront to all the Members of this General Assembly in this House of Representatives, since that Conference Committee had not met in any of the three proposed spots, but in fact, the transportation proposal is included in that legislation. I stand before you and say that I have been informed that there are seven Members that signed that Conference Committee report and that Amendment. John Dunn and I had the opportunity to examine only one copy, the first copy we were given, was an Amendment to 2348 which was not the vehicle. .. Stand before you also saying that the hour of twelve o'clock is upon us. We did nothing to derail that train except ask questions and look for answers. We have not



received those answers. The proposal in my estimation, since we were not accorded the Conference Committee time, would most certainly affect the collar counties and the suburban area of the State of Illinois as well as Cook and the downstate areas. I say to you now and to the Members who came to me as soon as I hit this door, I was not here voting on some of the questions that were printed... presented before us procedurally on 2348 and neither was John Dunn. We make that a public statement. We both feel that Members of the House of Representatives were not accorded their due responsibilities on such an important issue as transportation in the State of Illinois. Two hours, this House has deliberated 2348. Believe me, that you downstaters that were appointed to that Conference Committee have not sold out any interests to the collar counties, the suburban areas, the downstate people, or Chicago because we, in fact, in fact, have not yet to see that Amendment and I think it's totally grossly unfair. The train was on the track. The whistle was blowing. Right now, I don't know where the hell it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As Representative Mautino has said, I'm, to the best of our knowledge, the only other known House Member who appeared at the Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1072 which was scheduled for 10:45 p.m. yesterday in room 122-A. When Representative Mautino and I went there, there was no one there. There was a note to meet behind the podium in the President of the Senate's Office. We went there. There was no one there. We looked in the President of the Senate's Office ourselves. There was no one there. We subsequently found someone behind the podium. A few Members



straggled in. I regret to say, but I saw with my own eyes a couple of Members of the .. appointed to the Conference Committee sign the last page of the report. I can't swear that they had not seen the report before, but I feel certain that they signed it in blank. Representative Mautino and I did not sign it. We have between us been presented with one copy of what is proposed as a Conference Committee report to House Bill 2348. We were told that the substance of this is the same as the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1072. The Conference Committee report on House Bill 2348 is a 65 page document which we have been presented since 11:00 o'clock which is on a different Bill and I would echo Representative Mautino's remarks that this certainly is not the way to treat State Government. It's not the way to treat the House of Representatives. It's not the way to treat Members of the Conference Committee and lastly, and most important of all, it certainly is not the way to treat the taxpayers when we're talking about considering something like this which many Members, including Representative Mautino and myself, have been asking for for weeks and weeks and days and days and hours and hours and we have been told that this is a eight billion dollar package to be spread over six years and we were not permitted to see it. I believe it is on file, signed by seven Members of the Conference Committee and I hope the taxpayers will pass judgment on this kind of activity. If we are to fund a highway program and we need money for our road program, we should do it in a deliberate fashion with proper hearings, input from the taxpayers, input from all Members and input to all Members. And we should not take action until that time and until that takes place I certainly hope this House of Representatives and this General



Assembly takes no action on any road program for the State of Illinois. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Repres... Representative Conti. Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm very happy to hear...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti, please."

Conti: "I'm happy... very happy to hear the two downstaters just make their brief remarks which proves to me and restored my confidence that there is not a Chinese wall between Cook County and downstate. They have restored the faith in the legislative process and I hope we've learned a lesson that Illinois is not divided from upstate and downstate, that we've had our downstate friends protect our interests up in Cook County and I, for one, want to thank these two downstate Gentlemen for their sincere efforts in trying to bring the legislative process integrity back the to legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's a somewhat academic matter at this point as we have passed midnight, but I do want to say for the record and I know that the Members whose names I use will confirm what I'm saying. Last night when I moved to nonconcur as the House Sponsor of Senate Bill 1072, I was asked by Representative Daniels and then by Representative Davis and Representative Matijevidch to give my word that it was not my intention to use this as a vehicle for the transportation program. I was called twice today after it was discovered that this could be a potential vehicle and asked if I would give my permission to use that. I repeated both times that I had given my word to these people that that would not be done. And I just want to have it in the record that I kept my word on that. About an hour ago, maybe a little more than an hour ago, I received



a letter indicating that the Senate Sponsor under a proper rule of the House of Representatives had exercised his right to remove me from the Conference Committee. That's his right. I have no particular objection to that. As soon as I received that notice I notified Representative Daniels, Representative Davis that that had happened so I have no particular comment on the program one way or the other, but I did want to make it clear that I had kept my word and my commitment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Jim Reilly is an honorable man. And I'm sure that his standing up in front of you and telling you what had occurred yesterday when we asked in good faith if he were to use this Bill as a vehicle for the Department of Transportation budget, and Representative Reilly advised us that he would not use it and if he were asked to he would table the Bill if necessary. Unfortunately, through a rule in the Senate, they have replaced Representative Reilly as a Sponsor of that Bill to circumvent a word of honor that he gave to place him in the position that he can not live up by his choice to his word of honor. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am asking the new Sponeor of that Bill to live up to the word of honor as a Member of this House, and to be honorable and to follow Representative Ryan's word.. Reilly's word that he gave to us. We have a package for transportation. That package has been submitted to the Director of Transportation. We've been working with downstate. We can work on a method to fund the RTA so they can effectively operate. It's to that goal that we want to move. And we'll continue to work in that direction. And we ask for their cooperation."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just so that we don't get bogged down too far in what we're going to have to undo over the next two or three days or couple of weeks. Representative Walsh if you would listen. Representative Friedrich made a motion relating to all of the legislation we have. I wonder if it would be acceptable to the Chair and the Membership that that motion be made but limited at least to the appropriation measures we have before us. There's an awful lot of time that has gone into that and an awful lot of meetings and Conference Committees and it would be really a terrible waste of time and effort to have that all go by the Board. None of that can be used, Representative Walsh, for the problems.. or the purposes that you're talking about. So if I might, Mr. Speaker and .. Mr. Speaker, if you would agree, I would renew the motion made by Representative Friedrich and have it apply to the appropriation Bills that they may be on the Calendar in the same order."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I don't object in general. And I wasn't the one that raised the objection, but just to make the point that I have no objection to removing those appropriation Bills that are funding the ordinary and contingent expenses of the various agencies and Boards of State Government. We can do that, it seems to me, in one motion. I have no problem with that at all. Except that I would.. I would ask that there be no appropriation there in anticipation of any of the taxes that are .. were discussed or were supposed to have been in the Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1072. Is that fair enough?"

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. Representative



Bullock. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on the same point I raised on originally when Representative Friedrich wanted to offer this motion. I get the sense of the posture of the motion as Representative Peters wishes to proceed with it. Representative Peters, are you restricting that motion to appropriation measures to finance State Government only? Is that the essence? Is that the posture of your motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich?"

Bullock: "Peters, I think, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Peters, pardon me."

Peters: "Yes, Representative Bullock. I am concerned that all the work that has gone into the various budgets as we have now. And the Conference Committees are here. No funds can be added to that so the reports are already printed. And it would be. It may just be a disastrous waste of time to have all that go back, by the Board. I am limiting it to what you say, yes."

Bullock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, with that understanding and with that on the record, I certainly would not object to the Gentleman's motion."

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

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was concerned about the funding of your roads just as well. And I would object to that and let him talk to the people that were mouthing off for the last two hours. So I'll object to any of those motions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf.."

Terzich: "If it doesn't carry, I want a verification.."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, if there were objections, I believe Rule 68.. Rule 68 D and E I think.. or at least 68.E



would be the appropriate rule and I believe that it can be suspended and I think Mr. Peters should move for suspension of that Rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker"

Speaker Redmond: "I've recognized Peters."

Peters: "I don't want to cause any kind of problems. If it's objectionable, I don't .. you know, want to cause any kind of problem. But we are going to get into a big hassle by trying to unravel this in regards to appropriations. If it's the sense of the House not to do it, I won't make.. I won't make the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess till 10:00 a.m. This will give the staff some time to come up with a list. The matters that are alive that are on the table will take 107 votes in order to take from the table to vote and the House will require, I believe, the staff to come up with a listing as far as the Senate Bills and the status of the Senate Bills. I believe..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape. Oh, pardon me. Representative Slape?"

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a motion that the House take from the table all... a substitute motion that the House take from the table of all Bills that are now on Concurrence or are on Conference Committee or are on Nonconcurrence, excluding Senate Bill 1072."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz has raised a point of order and it's well taken. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "Well, I guess to ask the Chair where we are now. We've got a motion to recess, a motion to ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we have.."

Ryan: "Well, what's the motion before the House?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, would you withdraw your motion for about ten minutes? I think we should recess.. recess for ten minutes. Motion to recess for ten minutes so we can discuss it and see where... Wait a minute now. Let me... Wait a minute. I've been advised by the staff that there are probably 12 or 14 appropriation Bills that have not yet been considered by the Conference Committee that includes DOT, many other large agencies, some of the ones that we have on the Calendar here are extremely important. There has been no .. My memory, my Calendar indicates that the appropriation for the Office of the Governor has not been adopted and passed. It seems .. It would seem to me that under these circumstances and it kind of passed my mind that perhaps the way to do it would be taking it Bill by Bill. And those that are unobjectionable and are important, we can take care of it in that manner. The Senate is still in Session the last I heard. The Republicans were in conference and the Democrats were looking for the Republicans to come in. And now there isn't much that we can do without discussing it with the Senate. If we're going to continue along now and finish the work and everybody go home. That's one thing. If we're going to have to come back tomorrow, that's another thing. It would seem to me that we should discuss this with the Leaders of the Majority and the Minority side and see if we can get hold of the Leaders in the Senate to decide where we're going to go. I'm only talking about 10 or 15 minutes. Repres.. Representative Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that we recess for ten minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed 'no'. The



House will stand.. the House will stand in recess for ten minutes. The Minority and the Majority Leaders meet in the Speaker's Office please. Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you arise? You're Leverenz , aren't you?"

Leverenz : "I'm little Ted. Mr. Speaker, did I just hear the train?"

Speaker Redmond:"I don't know."

Leverenz : "Oh, I'm sorry. Is this San Fransisco? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Some people hear bells in their sleep. The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #4 is now being distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to the Bills of the following title; Senate Bill 494. House Amendment #1, action taken by the Senate June 30th, 1979. Kenneth Wirght, Secretary. Message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendments to Bills of the following title; Senate Bill 157 which Amendments are as follows; House Amendments #1,2,3,4,5,8,11,12,13,14, 15,16,17,18,19,20,22,27,28,30,31,32,33,34,36,38,44, 45,46, and 47. Action taken by the Senate June 30th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to Bills of the following



title; to wit, Senate Bill #891, together with the following Amendments; House Amendments #1,2,3,4,5,6,8, 9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,22,24,38,45,53,56, and 65. Action taken by the Senate June 30th, 1979.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I have before me Supplemental #4. Could the Speaker explain to me inasmuch as we went past twelve midnight, since we're now in July 1st, since all the Bills have been tabled, how we can be in House Calendar #1 (sic) when all these Bills have been tabled, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Technically they're not before us. The House Bills at least will have to be taken from the table."

Jaffe: "Well, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the House Bills are tabled, they are not properly upon the Calendar, Sir. And there is no Calendar. I just don't understand how we can have a Calendar when we don't have a Calendar by your own ruling."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I do have another parliamentary inquiry. It seems to me that we are now on July 1st. How can we have Supplemental #4 when we really haven't had Calendar #1 on July 1st?"

Speaker Redmond: "We can amend that on its face it we need it and call it number one."

Jaffe: "Well, we have no... We have no Regular Calendar, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest to you that since we do not have a Regular Calendar, we certainly can't have Supplemental #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you did say that you were going to go for ten minutes, which turned out to be forty minutes. But I would like to know the inten-



tion of the Chair and I'll let you know what my intentions are."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there will be a motion put very shortly...."

Terzich: "Well, I make a motion that we adjourn until ten a.m."

Speaker Redmond: "No..Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Do I properly understand the system that the Rathskeller is supposed to be open while the House is in Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "Except on weekends."

Vinson: "Well, I really wish that whoever's in charge of that would get them to perform a little. It's been pretty pathetic in recent weeks."

Speaker Redmond: "You're stealing Representative Griesheimer's thunder. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I.. You know, I think that the Members should be informed as to what our posture is here, as I understand it and you could help me out. "How much work do we have left to do just to take care of the normal operations to fund government and to finish out the appropriations in hours? Can you tell me?"

Speaker Redmond: "I can't tell you in hours, but there's at least 30 Bills. What would you say, Representative Barnes? You know better than I do how many there are? 34 Bills remaining."

Ryan: "Alright. Well, some body..."

Speaker Redmond: "Appropriation Bills.."

Ryan: "Well, somebody in the back..."

Barnes: "The problem with that though, Mr. Speaker, as I understand our rules, you don't have a Calendar so you don't have any Bills at all. And you cannot..."

Speaker Redmond: "You have the Bills.."



Barnes: "Well, let me finish. Bills, as I understand the rules, the Bills were all tabled as of twelve midnight. Number one, you cannot take them from the table unless they are on the Regular Calendar. No such Calendar exists. You cannot have a Supplemental Calendar unless you have a Regular Calendar. It simply doesn't exist. You have approximately 34 Bills true enough. But I don't see how under our rules, 'Robert's Rules' or anyone else's rules, that you can act on them since there is no Calendar in existence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, as I understand it, there's probably a minimum of nine or ten hours work left to do in the House. I think that there are some things that we can do yet this evening to cut down the time that we have to put in here tomorrow. And I don't think there's any doubt that we're going to be here tomorrow. Now, would you agree with that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "I agree.."

Ryan: "And I would suggest that we.. that we do the things that we have to do or at least, try to do a few of them so we're not in here at midnight tomorrow night."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, if we're going to go through with these 34 Bills, at the appropriate time I'd like to be recognized each time for an oral verification on each one."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's alright. Now, Representative ... Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I made several parliamentary inquiries and I haven't heard a reply from the Chair yet. I asked.."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken, but a motion will be put that we will address ourselves to the point that you're raised. Representative Peters."

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



would now make the following motion; I move to suspend Rule 68 D and Rule 68E.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative.. Representative.. Representative Pierce.. Representative..."

Peters: "For the purposes of taking the following House Bills from the table; House Bill 1168, House Bill 1170, 1288, 1636, 1640, 1642. 1644, 1645, 1646, 1647, 1657, 2004, 2427, 2577, 2578, 2579, and further to suspend Rule 8, the daily Calendar Rule for all House and Senate Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich is recognized. "

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I made a motion that we go in recess and I made it before Representative Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. We'll put the motion."

Terzich: "There's nothing on the Calendar. If we're on today, let's get some sleep and you correct your....."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Terzich has moved that the House recess till ten tomorrow...til ten this morning. Is that correct? All those in favor of the motion vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Gentleman who made the motion.. I thought I heard him say something at the end and I'm not quite sure because I respect the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters. You read off a list of approximately 34 appropriation measures. But the thing that I heard you say at the end included other Bills. Now, is that correct or is it not correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters. We're on Representative Terzich's motion incidently."

Bullock: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I thought we were on Representative Peters'...."

Speaker Redmond: "No. No. We're on Representative Terzich's motion."



Bullock: "Then I withdraw my comments and wait until we..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative O'Brien?"

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, we worked from eight o'clock until twelve o'clock on nothing but folly. And that's your responsibility, Mr. Speaker. We took measures that were not appropriation measures. Mr. Speaker, three-fourths of the state budget has not been appropriated and requires 107 votes. We didn't get the opportunity Mr. Speaker, to talk about the Byrne-Thompson proposal. Mr. Speaker, you talk about task force in this General Assembly that work on our measures. Well, Mr. Speaker, that task force never reported to the Members of the General Assembly and the first measures that I heard in relation to the road fund and the RTA funds came from the 'Byrne/Thompson's proposal'. Not once, Mr. Speaker, did we have a conference or a caucus in relation to that measure. In my estimation, Mr. Speaker, Leadership failed for some reason to address itself to that issue, Mr. Speaker. For that reason I'm tired. I've put in a long day. There are a lot of important appropriation measures. There are a lot of Conference Committees that are still going on and I am going to work with certain Members to verify every, single, solitary Roll Call and we're going to divide every question. We ought to come back tomorrow morning at ten o'clock with a fresh look and a new approach at this problem, Mr. Speaker and it rests on your shoulders, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Representative Peters' motion, if we would look at Rule #63- a motion to take from the table shall not be taken off until it appears on the daily Calendar. That has not happened. Motions to take from the table may be filed with the Clerk at any time and shall appear on the daily Calendar on the next legislative day. I would



suggest that cannot entertain Representative Peters' motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish on Representative Terzich's motion? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 41 'aye' and 107 'no'. Representative Terzich is recognized."

Terzich: "I'd like a verification of Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest in view of the obvious vote that that is dilatory."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I have not seen one time this Session, nor have I asked for any. And I ask for a verification of a Roll Call and I have a right just as well as any other Member to ask for that verification. I don't care..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman is within his rights. We will have a verification of the negative Roll Call. Verify the negative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Everybody be in your seat when your name is called. Please stand and raise your hand."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Borchers. Boucek. Bowman. Bullock. Capuzi. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. Currie. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Donovan. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Friedrich. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hannig. Hoffman. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Katz. Keane. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen, for what reason do you arise?"

Christensen: "Could I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Can the Gentleman be verified? May he be verified, Mr. Terzich? Representative Terzich objects. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "I .. Seems like the 'no's have an agreed Majority and I'd like to join them because I don't think there's an opportunity for the positive votes to win. So I will vote with Representative Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly desires to be recorded as 'no'. Is that correct? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Margulas. Matijeovich. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McGrew. McMasters. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey..."

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

Simms: "I would suggest that since we're working past the hour of midnight that the camera lights be turned off."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Murphy. Oblinger. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sharp. Simms. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Steczo. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser, Tuerk, Vinson. VonBoeckman. Waddell. Watson. Wikoff. Willer. Williams. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Youzell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the negative Roll Call, Mr. Terzich?"

Terzich: "Yes. Representative Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Collins? He's back near Mr. Ryan."

Terzich: "How about Representative Klosak?"

Speaker Redmond: "Klosak? Representative Klosak here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."



Terzich: "Representative Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here, in the middle aisle."

Terzich: "Representative VonBoeckman?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Terzich: "Representative Schisler?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler? In the back there."

Terzich: "Representative Epton?"

Speaker Redmond: "Epton? How is he recorded? Epton."

Terzich: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Friedrich,
for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedrich: "Point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your point?"

Friedrich: "My point, Mr. Speaker, is that this is obviously dilatory. There's no way... There's not that many absentees if he had them all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VonBoeckman, put him back on the Roll Call. I can't.. I can't say whether it is or isn't. I believe that he's within his rights though, so we'll proceed. McAuliffe? Did you ask for McAuliffe? Is he here?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Terzich: "Representative Abramson."

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

Terzich: "Representative Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "Pierce? He's in the back there."

Terzich: "How about Representative Kelly?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly? How is he recorded?
No, she changed."

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



Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Terzich: "Representative Kane?"

Speaker Redmond: "Gaines? Representative Terzich, who did you say? Representative Gaines?"

Terzich: "Kane. Kane. Doug Kane."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he here? Gaines is over here."

Terzich: "What's he doing over on the other side? How about Representative Yourell?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell is right there. Representative Yourell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Yourell: "I want to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Did we take Pierce off?"

Terzich: "No, he's right here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Terzich: "How about Representative Margulas?"

Speaker Redmond: "Margulas? He's back there. Representative Slape, for what purpose do you arise?"

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago the House of Representatives heard the House Bill that was supposed to be the Chicago program. They had a little minor defeat so now we're going to have to sit here while they go through their little games. And I think that this Roll Call is completely out of line. It's completely out of order. 107 to 41 is dilatory. And I think that they should go back and tell Mr. Brady to call Ms. Byrne and tell her they tried, but they lost and I think we should go on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. The Gentleman is within his rights. Proceed with the verif..."

Terzich: "Apparently he's the only one that knows how



to play the game. But how about Representative
Friedland?"

Speaker Redmond: "Friedland's in the back there."

Terzich: "I can't see him. John, would you stand up so
I can see you? Alright. Alright. How about Represent-
ative Stearney?"

Speaker Redmond: "Stearney? Is Stearney here? He's in the
back. Center aisle. Representative Friedland?"

Friedland: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'no'."

Terzich: "Can I have Representative Ryan?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ryan is standing there."

Terzich: "How about Representative ... No, Garmisa's not
here. How about Representative Piel? Nope, he's
standing over there. How about Representative Farley?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley back there? There
he is. Representative McAuliffe has returned. Put
him back on. Representative Campbell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Campbell: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'no'. Representative
James Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you please change my vote to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'no'. Represent-
ative Deuster."

Deuster: "Please change me to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change him to 'no'. Representative
Johnson."

Johnson: "What is the procedure for removing one's name
from a Conference Committee report? I'd ask leave
to remove my name as a signatore to House Bill 292,
the arson investigator's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't... I think it's filed. I don't



know how you do it. Representative McMasters."

McMasters: "Mr. Speaker, I was off the floor when this motion was being voted on was called. Do I understand it to be that it's a motion to recess until noon later on today?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ten o'clock."

McMasters: "Well, I'll still vote 'yes' on that motion. But I think it should be until noon rather than ten."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I'm recorded 'aye'. I'd like to change my vote to 'no' and then inform Mr. Terzich that I'm going to go out for a little while and I'll leave to be verified off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich, any more questions?"

Terzich: "Yes. Representative Totten?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's still here."

Terzich: "Will you duck, Don?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Doyle desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Parliamentarian would give us his opinion on Rule 38 of Robert's Rules, page 290 dealing with dilatory and improper motions? It says that a motion's dilatory if it seeks to obstruct or thwart the role of the Assembly as clearly indicated by the existing Parliamentary situation. Parliamentary forms are designed to assist in the transaction of business and so on... And it gives, as a matter of fact, an example of precisely this kind of thing when it's very clear that if a Member could demand a division on every vote, even when the result was clear, then business could be brought to a standstill. That's on the next page, on page 291. And it says, 'Whenever the Chair becomes convinced that one or more Members are using parliamentary form for obstructive purposes, he should



either not recognize those Members or he should rule that such motions are out of order'.

Speaker Redmond: "I.. You know, I may have my own opinion, but if you think I'm going to rule it's dilatory, you're crazy. I'm not going to get carried with the fireman's carry up to the second floor. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes. Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Redmond: "Capuzi? Is he here? Capuzi here? Remove him. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'd like to appeal the ruling of the Chair on the dilatory question."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I ruled that I couldn't read his mind and I know Representative Terzich is a very industrious man and..."

Friedrich: "I believe, Sir, that you ruled that it was not dilatory and I appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, would you please ask the Mayor of Chicago if I could have leave to be verified please?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Slape: "Would you please ask the Mayor of Chicago or one of her aides down here if I could have leave to be verified please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I object. Check with Jim Thompson first and let me know what he says. I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi's in the center aisle. If we took him off, put him back on. Anything further, Representative Terzich?"

Terzich: "Representative Johnson?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Terzich: "Tim Johnson."

Speaker Redmond: "He was here a minute ago. How is he recorded?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Terzich: "How about Representative Waddell?"

Speaker Redmond: "Waddell's in the back."

Terzich: "I think I'll probably lose this motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "My name was made... And let me tell you this, I've got a long memory and any time that you bring firemen legislation you can count on my 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy to report I've found the ghost train. It was distributed in the Senate. It does have signatures of Harlan Rigney, Robert Winchester, Senator Chew, Senator Nash, Senator Savickas, Senator Bloom and apparently a rubber stamp of Senator Shapiro's signature. It's dated on June 30th, 1979 although only three copies apparently remain. The pages were asked to retrieve them after they were passed out. I want to tell you I think it's a hell of a way to consider the major piece of legislation of a Session when all you get is a one page explanation sheet to a 60 page Bill and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the role that you have played in making certain we have time for deliberation on this.. on this piece of legislation rather than acting like a piece of sheet metal going through a metal stamping machine."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino. That matter is not really before the House. We're on a question of verification of the negative Roll Call. Tim Johnson is back. Put him back on the Roll Call. Anything further, Representative Terzich?"

Terzich: "No, Mr. Speaker. It just goes to prove why we should recess until ten o'clock. I'm finished."

Speaker Redmond: "39 'aye' and 110 'no'. The motion fails. Representative Peters. Back to Representative Peters'



motion. Representative Jaffe on a point of order."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. With regard to Representative Peters' motion, I would refer you to Rule 63 which says, 'A motion to take from the table shall not be taken off until it appears on the daily Calendar. Motions to take from the table shall may be filed with the Clerk at any time and shall appear on the daily Calendar on the next Legislative Day.' I would suggest to you that we cannot at this time hear Representative Peters' motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Suspension of the Rule is part of that motion, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Well, that should... That takes 107 votes. Does it not, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Correct."

Jaffe: "Alright."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters' motion will take 107 votes. Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Well, Speaker, I think that the Roll Call is clear that everybody wants to stay and work. However, I'm not sure whether or not everybody wants to work on the same measure. Before we go to Representative Peters' motion which I'm aware contains several appropriation measures that are important, that stand before the state, I think that the Chair ought to give the Membership a little explanation of what its intentions are before we take Representative Peters' motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, my intentions are if Representative Peters' motion carries is to go to the appropriation Bills that are necessary to operate State Government and do that tonight. And then .. And then come back tomorrow at roughly ten o'clock in the morning. Now that's..."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there presently is being a Supplemental Calenadr being printed up



downstairs, Supplemental #5. What I would like to know and several of the Members on both sides of the aisle would like to know, is whether or not Senate Bill 1072 is indicated... is listed on that Supplemental Calendar #5?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't have the slightest idea."

O'Brien: "Is there anybody that does?"

Speaker Redmond: "I have a copy of it and it is listed on this Calendar."

O'Brien: "I, like many Members, are ready to discuss one of the more important issues that face State Government. And I think we've been shirking our responsibility and I think we can get at it. Should the Chair provide us with assurances that 1072 will be on Supplemental #5 so we can take it up tomorrow morning, I think we can begin with the matters... with the appropriation matters that are presently before the House."

Speaker Redmond: "It is on Calendar #5. It is on #5 and it's being distributed. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, regarding to the remarks that Mr.

O'Brien made, I would agree with his remarks and suggest that the only thing before the House that can possibly be before the House without any suspension of the rules is Calendar that was sent, Calendar #5. Because it's dated July 1st of 1979 and it also meets the requirements with Senate Bill 1072 that it is before us properly without having to suspend the rule as I understand the ruling of the Parliamentarian. If it takes a motion to suspend, it takes 89 votes. It's the only thing that can be before us without suspending the rule on the Calendar date or any other rule. So I would suggest if we want to get something done on the floor of the House tonight, that we address ourselves and that's what the Leadership wants to do. Let's go to Calendar #.. Supplemental #5. It's before us and



properly before us and we don't have to suspend the rule of the Calendar or anything else and let's go ahead and do the business of the House in Supplemental #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Representative Peters has moved that the rules be suspended to permit the consideration of the appropriation Bills, the list of which I believe has been distributed. Now, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Representative Peters restate his motion because it was said in .. hurriedly and in the midst of other conversations. And also to specify at that time the Bills that are comprehended by his motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters, can you respond?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure I heard all of what the Representative Braun said, but she wanted a restatement of the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "She wanted you to repeat the motion. That's correct."

Peters: "I think the Clerk has the motion in writing there. It's to suspend Rule, my memory serves me now, 68 3.. E.."

Speaker Redmond: "63, 68?"

Clerk O'Brien: "63, 68-D and 68 E."

Peters: "Right. Which is the..."

Clerk O'Brien: "And Rule 8."

Peters: "Right, rule to allow the hearing of these Bills after June 30th and to suspend the posting...or suspend the rule requiring that they be on the Calendar for one day before it could be heard. And they are House Bills."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker?"

Peters: "Those appropriation Bills."

Braun: "Would you recite.. I understand.. I understood you to recite at that time the numbers of the Bills that



were included. We don't have the print out here. Would you recite the numbers of the Bills?"

Peters: "You want me to recite the number?"

Braun: "Please."

Peters: "Would you be interested also in the indicating what those appropriations apply to?"

Braun: "That would be very nice."

Speaker Redmond: "Read them slowly please."

Peters: "House Bill 1168, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 1170, the Fair Employment Practices Commission. 1288, the Legislative Investigative Commission. 1636, the Racing Board. 1640, Human Relations Commission. 1642, the State Fair Agency. 1644, Department of Children and Family Services. 1645, Department of Mines and Minerals. 1646, the Industrial Commission. 1647, the appropriation for the Office of the Governor. 1657, the Department of Conservation. 2004, which is the Omnibus Commission Bill which we sent to the Senate and now they sent back to us. 2427, which is the Capital Development Board Bill. 2428, which is the Capital Development Board authorizations. 2577, the Department of Labor. 2578, Public Health. 2579, the Law Enforcement Commission. That's the entire list."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I'd like to ask Representative Peters a couple of questions..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

O'Brien: "About the list. Representative Peters, there are many Bills on the Calendar that are important to Members that have been working for the last two weeks in relation to the budget matters. Some of those measures are the Civil Rights measures, 1377. Is that included on your list, Representative Peters?"



Peters: "Representative O'Brien, I wish that it was listed from my perspective, but it is not. If it would be the sense of the House, as I indicated before, to include all Bills. That would be fine with me because we would save the staff and the people who are working an awful lot of problems. But that's what I tried before and there was objection to it."

O'Brien: "What about.. What about the insurance code? Is that on the list?"

Peters: "They're not on here either."

O'Brien: "What about the Department of Conservation?"

Peters: "That is on here."

O'Brien: "Well, who put this list together?"

Peters: "Representative O'Brien, we tried to get first those Bills in which we thought there was agreement to be- cause they have been reported out of the Conference Committees favorably. These are..."

O'Brien: "Representative..."

Peters: "Plus these are the House Bills which we do need a suspension of the rules to act on. We thought that we could get to these Bills, work on some of them, and hopefully, then, we would have the consensus of the sense of the House that we need an appropriation... er that we need a suspension of the rules to hear all of the legislation, including that piece of legislation that you are vitally interested in."

O'Brien: "Well, Representative Peters, I understand that you weren't in on the deal that was made that put these packages together and that these Bills are important to a certain number of people in this Chamber. But maybe I ought to direct this question to the Chair. What are we going to do with the other important measures that the people have worked on, the Members have worked on and what is the Chair going to do in terms of insuring us that we will have action taken on



ask that the staff, if at all possible, to kindly review the Calendar from today and to see what Members.. various proposals were left and that a similar motion to protect the Membership Bills be done tomorrow morning. It's my intention to support the motion. It's my intention that a Calendar be created. But I would hope that we would not call any appropriation Bills later on.. er.. earlier this morning. Thank you."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, may I address that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Peters: "Representative Lechowicz, I thank you very much for your statement. I think that it is a reasonable approach. If this motion would pass and with the guidance of the Chair and the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader and all the Leaders on both sides, if it's agreeable, then it would seem to me the next reasonable motion would be to suspend the same rules in regard to all other House Bills still on our Calendar so at least we put ourselves in the posture of having the Bills there. Now, if that's not agreeable, then I.. I will not make that motion. But sooner or later that will have to be done."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Peters' motion. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. It requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 7 'no', and the motion prevails. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I would now hope that the House would ... Sir, did you say that the motion prevailed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Prevails, right."

Lechowicz: "I would hope that the House now would work on the matters that have to go to a Conference Committee so the Bills that we've just made the motion on, so the Conference Committees can meet and make a report."



With any other matter I'll be... I'll be addressing the matter individually."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, on that motion, Mr. Speaker, I..I.. We discussed before our recess when talking about taking from the table that many of us had no objection to taking whatever is on the table off the table so that it could be considered except that we wanted a commitment that we would not again be embroiled in the so called Thompson-Byrne package and I wonder if we can get that commitment? If we can't, I object to taking anything else from the table."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to make an inquiry or a suggestion. It's my understanding we now have taken a number of appropriation Bills from the table and they are now in a position where they will appear on a Calendar, so we can have a Calendar. I'm wondering whether it wouldn't be appropriate at this time for Members who are handling individual Bills who want to present similar motions to have them filed so that all of those motions can appear on the Calendar so that when we come back at ten o'clock or whenever, we will consider those motions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I.. Did I remember correctly? Didn't Representative Lechowicz make a motion with regard..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah.."

Bowman: "With regard to the other Bills? Wasn't that a formal motion? Representative Lechowicz make a formal motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Did you make a motion, Representative Lechowicz?"



Bowman: "With regard to the other Bills? Well, Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he did."

Bowman: "Yes. I thought my memory served me correctly. I'd like to rise in support of the Gentleman's motion. And in response to Representative Walbh, I really don't know from whom we would exact the committment. Besides we now have on our desks the Confer... the first Conference report on Senate Bill 1072. It's, you know, printed. It's on our desks. I was one of those people who was opposing the.. the use of the 24.. 38 whatever it was.. of this... Right now, I'm getting a little fuzzy. But, I opposed the use of that Bill as a vehicle. I would be very happy and delighted to see it ground into the dust at this point. But it seems to me in fairness to all, that we ought to make this motion apply to all Bills. Besides at this stage, in order for any Bill to pass, it would require 107 votes and I think that's a sufficient burden for any deal around here to carry and I would support the Gentleman and his motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, want to echo what Representative.. the previous speaker has said because I, too, am getting a little fuzzy. But I.. This is my third term down here and it's amazing how, when you get to this time of the Session, you don't know whether Session this year or last year or the year before because it all sounds the same. But I do want to make my point and my point is this; that you need to have a psycho-semantic around you to interpret what's going on because everything that we're saying at this point is so semantical that it no longer carries on its face the connotative value that those words would intend to imply because I still haven't heard any definitive response to the question raised by Repre-



sentative O'Brien. And that is, are we going to deal with 1072 or 2340 with regard to this problem that's been dumped in our lap? And I just... I didn't want to take this much time of the House, but I do want to add a few points as to why I'm taking this position. And I, too, like Representative Woody Bowman, originally was against .. or at least stressed some caution as we approached the subject. But I think that we should approach it nevertheless because what we're doing here, there are a lot of people who at this moment, the taxpayers, who are frightened and somewhat bewildered about the fuel crunch and how it is going to impact on transportation, the economy, their public tranquility, and everything else. And they've turned to this Body and this Body, in my opinion, has characteristically done what is always done when it's faced with problems that come from the real world, and that is adopting the ostrich complex. The oyster's not a bad example either. It has a tight clamp. But what I think we should do, Ladies and Gentlemen, is accept this challenge at least one time around and try to deal with this problem. And I'd like to hear and I'm sure there will be other Members growing to this list... It takes 107 votes. All we're asking is some clarification on the matters we are discussing in caucus."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a parliamentary inquiry that I think might clarify this situation for a lot of people. House Rule 68 E, if I understand your interpretation, whatever we're talking about with regard to taking Bills off the table, in no way would affect Senate Bill 1072. Because, as I read this and as I understand it has been interpreted, those Senate Bills are under the control of the Senate



and therefore, have not been tabled. Is my understanding correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's true that they have not been ... That Bill has not been tabled by our rules. But the rule would have to be suspended in order that they could be.. it could be considered. So our rules do not table the Senate Bill, but preclude our considering the Senate Bill without the suspension of the rule."

Kempiners: "May I ask a further question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Kempiners: "With regard to the list of appropriation Bills that we have already suspended the rules on it, it's: my understanding they are all House Bills. What then is the status of appropriation Bills which are Senate Bills?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz is going to amend his motion, I understand."

Lechowicz: "That is correct, Mr. Speaker. The following Senate Bills would be included in my motion; Senate Bill 157, which is the Omnibus Appropriation Comm... Omnibus Commission Bill. It's 535 million. Senate Bill 484, 29 million for Agriculture OCE. Senate Bill 487, 202 million for Local Governmental Affairs. Senate Bill 546, 2 million 300 thousand, State Board of Election. Senate Bill 576, BOB. Senate Bill 577, Natural Resources. Senate Bill 578, various state agencies. Senate Bill 580, the Department of Revenue. Senate Bill 581, Business and Economic Development. Senate Bill 584, Delinquency Prevention. Senate Bill 587, government of manpower OCE. Senate Bill 588, Law Enforcement. Senate Bill 590, Dangerous Drug Commission. Senate Bill 669, Pension Laws Commission. Senate Bill 830, Court of Claims. Senate Bill 891, Department of Transportation. Senate Bill 908, Supreme Court. Senate Bill 1272, Court of Claims." And, Mr. Speaker, that's to the best of our knowledge



of what was on the Calendar. There may a couple of other matters that are in the process of being transmitted to the House. I don't have the numbers of the Senate Bills at this time, but I would just for the record so we can create a Calendar for tomorrow morning, I would hope that these Bills would also be included in the amended motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know what time we're going to adjourn or what time we're going to be back here, but I'd like to suggest to you that we... all well and good when we do adjourn that staff on your side and our side, perhaps your own personal staff, perhaps has several hours of work after we do adjourn and I'd ask that you take that into consideration when you ask us to return. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "I will. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that it is now 2:25 and the Conference Committee report on Senate Bill 1072 has just reached our desks."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification. I'm sure I'm right, but I wanted to double check. Ted, your motion was for all present House substantive Bills including those Senate Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz. Now you're ready for the question. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I have before me Supplemental Calendar #5 on which appears among other things Senate Bill 1072. Rule 68 E would suggest that that Bill since it is a part of a Conference Committee is tabled. Now, can you tell me how that got on the Calendar or does the Calendar anticipate a motion to remove that Bill from the table?"



Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell us how it got on the Calendar?"

Clerk O'Brien: "All Conference Committees that have been turned in have been processed normally."

Walsh: "Well, yes. But it.. That's not normal. That is on the... According to Rule 68 E, that Conference Committee, that Bill, is on the table. So there must be a motion to take that from the table before it can appear on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien?"

O'Brien: "I'm interested in getting a ruling on Representative Walsh's question from the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I asked the Clerk to tell us how it got on there. These things are printed up at the direction of the Clerk. Now... Parliamentarian, the inquiry of Representative Walsh is that there's no motion to take it from the table and he's wondering how the Calendar #5 contains Senate Bill 1072. Tabled, it's a Senate Bill."

Walsh: "It is a Conference Committee, Mr. Speaker. Rule 68 E contemplates Conference Committee reports. It is therefore tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian disagrees with you."

Walsh: "May I read Rule 68 E?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe if you check the record Senate Bill 1072 was not in the control of the House at midnight. And for that reason it would not apply. And, Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that my motions for all House and Senate Bills of substance in conjunction with the Senate appropriation Bills that I mentioned."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh?"

Walsh: "Well, it's either one or the other. If his motion is to take it from the table, I can understand that and oppose it. But if he uses the argument that it is



not within the control of the House, I don't see where that makes any difference. The Conference Committee is in the control of both Houses and I call.. I call the Parliamentarian's attention to the Rule if he would read it."

Speaker Redmond: "Let's do like they do in Congress and let the Parliamentarian address this. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, before we took our ten minute recess I talked to Jim Edgar. This House... This Senate Bill 1072 we all know is the Thompson program. I talked to Jim Edgar and he said, all we want is our appropriation Bill so we can operate State Government. He said, that's all we want. Now, here we have at this late date when we want to operate State Government and I think if we all knew that that's all we wanted, we'd put this show on the road and operate State Government. Well, I don't know what aides to Governors are here for. I guess Representative Pierce keeps wanting to get in the act so I'll let him have his show."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, am I correct that if we put all the substantive Bills as well as the appropriation Bills in this motion and put them all out, then you can pass a substantive Bill with 89 votes and it would not be effective then for a year? And there are some substantive measures including possibly the RTA funding which could then be passed with 89 votes but would not be effective for another year and they could probably get away doing that..."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Totten: "Then, for those reasons, I would object to including the substantive Bills on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."



Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry. How many substantive Bills are there on the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't have the slightest idea."

Braun: "Would you ask the Parliamentarian if he knows how many?"

Speaker Redmond: "He knows many things, but I question if he'd know that."

Braun: "Are there in excess of 100 substantive Bills on the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "I've been told that there's something... In excess of 200."

Braun: "In excess of 200. Well, Mr. Speaker, to speak to the motion. I have to join Representative Matijevich. I have no difficulty with staying here until the wee hours or staying here till tomorrow to fund State Government. That's our responsibility. That's our job. We have to do that. But to stay here until July 16th to handle all the different substantive Bills that are on this Calendar seems to be unreasonable, seems in derogation of the rules and the intent of the Constitutional limitation on this Body. And I would for that reason, oppose this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready? You ready for the question on Representative Lechowicz's motion? Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I heard the key words and those were heard by other people and I join the people who are opposing this motion. The key words are 'and the substantive Bills in conjunction with the appropriation Bills'. Everyone knows that t substantive Bills in conjunction with the Capital Development budget is Senate Bill 1072, the RTA ghost train which has now appeared in brilliant pink. For that reason, I don't think we should let it out on the floor and if he wants to change his motion to make it merely appropriation



Bills, I would be happy to vote for it. But none of this.. I don't want the caboose."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have a ruling from the Chair whether Senate Bill 1072 is alive or dead even without this motion. I believe it's alive."

Skinner: "Well, if you're going to give that ruling, why don't you give a ruling of whether the Conference Committee report is germane to the Bill?"

Lechowicz: "So because I, you know, as far as my original... The only thing I was thinking of as far as the Membership of the House and the work, they put in all this time on their respective pieces of legislation and in all fairness we should try to create the Calendar the same shape that it appeared today whether you want to pass those measures or discuss, that's between the Sponsor and this Membership. And as far as ... What we're trying to do is create a Calendar in all fairness of what transpires so as to have a Calendar for tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few minutes... A few moments ago I made some statements before the House that perhaps I should apologize for. It was in response to some actions that were taken by ... at that particular time by some Members from a particular geographical area of our state. At this particular moment, I think that our Assistant Majority Leader, has made a valid and a very amenable motion and I would move now that the House move on this motion and we have a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Lechowicz's... Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I absolutely support the motion as far as appro-



priation Bills are concerned and want to move forward with the business of this House. But I absolutely resist the possibility that Senate Bill 1072 could pass with 89 votes and then be effective in one year. And that's the concern that we have right now and if you can give us a way of avoiding that, if you can pull that out of this motion, then we can deal with this. We have the other three Bills that have been mentioned earlier as possible vehicles that we want excluded too and we could work on the motion so that we could move forward with the work of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think there's any conceivable way that... that we could preclude 1072 being considered because that could be considered at any time with 89 votes as I understand it."

Daniels: "Then I would just suggest that you might want to divide the question and remove that from the question so that when the motion comes, we can vote on that Bill alone and Representative Lechowicz can put his motion on that Bill alone."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I'll exclude that Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Lechowicz: "I'll exclude 1072."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I would ask that the question be divided so that we can consider appropriation Bills separately from substantive Bills."

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

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, the whole contention in the House right now is Senate Bill 1072 and our Assistant Majority Leader has made a very, very forward... He's excluded it and I don't understand what the confrontation is and I think his motion excluding Senate Bill 1072



should be heard right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "As I said, they were three other Bills which I didn't give you the numbers of; House Bill 1062, House Bill 1911, House Bill 2348, and House Bill 2428."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, anyway, Representative Taylor, for what purpose do you arise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, since everyone has some concerns, I have some concerns about a few of those motions on the Speaker's Table, Postponed Concurrence and Postpond. I would like to see that those are removed from that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I make a substitute motion that the House hear all pending appropriation Bills first before any other business of the House. The operation of State Government I think we're all worried about."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that the Chair at this time give the Body the assurance and I don't think that any Member in this chamber should be afraid to debate the issue of 1072 up and down, argue it, the points for Cook County, the collar counties, and downstate. I think, Mr. Speaker, we can go on all day on these substitute motions on what's going to be included and what's not going to be included. But I don't think that we should have a problem with debating the issue and I think we should have assurances from you, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have the opportunity to have a Roll Call for the people of the State of Illinois on that issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I know Representative O'Brien is anxious to get a Roll Call for whatever purpose. But



he won't be able to get one before 2:20 a.m. tomorrow under our rules unless he's got 107 votes, so I wouldn't want you to get too anxious, Dan. You're going to be around here for a little while anyway."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Walsh has called for a division and under Rule 60D, I think that it is right. This motion is divisible I believe."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah. Everybody had their say? Representative ... Representative Walsh has moved for a division of the question. Move.. Yeah. He moves that the question be divided. Divided how, Mr. Walsh? Appropriations first. Representative Slape."

Slape: "I have a question of the Chair. Which motion are we moving on, Mr. Peters or Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well.."

Slape: "Lechowicz. ... My.. or the motion I made before we recessed. Which motion are we moving on?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're on Representative Lechowicz's motion. Representative Walsh moves that the question be divided. You have an objection? Representative Lechowicz."

Slape: "Representative Walsh has moved that the question be divided, but Mr. Lechowicz did not.. I would like for him to restate his motion please. And I think with his... with his very generous exclusion of Senate Bill 1072, I don't understand why there would be a question to separate these."

Speaker Redmond: "I asked Representative Lechowicz if he had any response to the motion to divide... to the request for the division of the question. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, you know, Mr. Speaker, some people question why I asked for a verification on a Roll Call which I've never done in my nine years in this House. And I'm



concerned about 1072. Now I may not have the staff or anyone else about this particular dilatory tactics, but it did happen for two and a half hours on this House and I'm just as concerned as they are about that Bill. And I want to have a fair shot at 1072 just the way they want to stop 1072 so let's take a vote on it. Let it go up or down. But let's give it a chance. If they're talking about holding up everything, well let's hold everything up. Let's give everyone a chance at their Bill, including 1072. I don't care if we do it for ten weeks. Let's do it. We can suspend any rule that we got on there so I may.. I would like to suspend the appropriate rule"

Speaker Redmond : "Representative Lechowicz has moved for suspension of the rules with respect to the substantive Bills on the Calendar with the exception of 1072. Is that.. And the appropriation Bills. And Representative Walsh asked for division of the question. Is that correct? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "You said that Representative Lechowicz's motion dealt with substantive Bills. It dealt with both substantive Bills and appropriation Bills..."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Walsh: " My motion is to divide so that we can consider appropriation Bills first. It's not... Mr. Speaker, you just do that. Rule 60... Call your attention to Rule 60 D."

Speaker Redmond: "I think he has it as a matter of right, quite frankly. The question... The question is on the motion with respect to the appropriation Bills first. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye', and 6 'no'. And the motion carries. Now the .. Wait till the machine does its duty. Now it's on Representative



Lechowicz's motion on the substantive Bill, House and Senate, taking the House Bills from the table. Those in favor.. except 1072. Those in favor... Yeah?"

Walsh: "Well, on the motion, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that the people who are talking about Members and Members getting their programs out and getting to work on them, everybody here, Mr. Speaker, knows that the Spring Session runs to June 30th preferably, and every once in a while a day or so after that. Anyone who has not moved their program by this time, Mr. Speaker, hasn't been very diligent about it and hasn't really thought that it ought to move. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, or else.. or else several of us, more than 89 felt that it shouldn't move. Now everybody's had a fair chance, Mr. Speaker, including me. I've had a fair chance at my program. Hasn't been terribly successful. But everybody else has also and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that for us to consider at this time substantive Bills on July 1st to begin and end God knows when, is .. is just beyond reason.. And I urge everyone to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The question.. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bullock. Representative O'Brien?"

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, can you tell us... Can you repeat the motion and at least let the Membership know what we're voting on."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you repeat your motion, Mr. Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, in all fairness, I think what we're trying to do is recoup the Calendar to its original existence and the Membership try to work on respective Bills. I think that we.. In all fairness, all my motion did was restore the Calendar for the House and Senate.



Bills excluding Senate Bill 1092 (sic). 1072, as far as substantive Bills that are on the Calendar. And you know, I really did not oppose the appropriation matter when it was divided, in all fairness, because the importance of the budget, but in all reality, what is fair is fair. And I don't believe Mr. Walsh's matter at this time is fair, not to me. Because all my Bills are out of both chambers already. But in all fairness to the Membership of this House this motion should be... should prevail."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich?"

Friedrich: "Well, I was going to ask under the exclusion, what would be the status of 1072? It would be on the table and it could still be removed at a later date, is that right?"

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to just make one correction to Representative Walsh. This was purported to be my last night here and it will be. I don't have anything on the Calendar. Haven't had anything on the Calendar for some time. But let me suggest to Representative Walsh or anyone else, what was on this Calendar tonight relative to substantive Bills was not substantive Bills that we had heard before that these Bills did not have any opportunity or any chance. What was left on this Calendar were Bills to either concur with or nonconcur with or go into Conference Committee. The issues that were involved in those Bills was a simple issue of whether or not we would act on those Bills and those Bills would go to the Governor's Office or whether or not they would not, in that regard. So this is not a matter of hearing substantive matter again. As I indicated to you, Mr. Speaker, and Members



of the House, I have nothing there, nothing whatsoever. But I say, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in all due respect to each and every House Member on both sides of this aisle, whether or not the Leadership and I don't care who was involved, whether or not the Leadership or anyone else would choose a particular number of Bills, have those Bills restored, not allow any other Members to have any of their legislation restored, when they do have an opportunity to get... to finish through the process that we started six months ago, it seems to me, I don't care who it is, it's disrespect not only to those Members in the House whose matters are involved, but it's a disrespect of the whole system of legislative government that we have in the State of Illinois. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and you, Mr. Speaker, who's been fairly been a fair man in all matters before this House since I have been here, to disallow at this point in juncture, to disallow any Member, any Member and I reiterate again, that I have nothing on that Calendar whatsoever, but to disallow any Member to have an opportunity for his ... his legislation, his or hers legislation after we have gotten to this point, all the way through the legislative Session to tell them that they will not have an opportunity again, to have that chance to get this to the Governor's desk, they've got to go through the whole process once more, to a Spring Calendar that may never be heard, to ... two years from now, to try to install into law what they worked on so hard for each and everyone of those individuals, I think is simply appalling. I don't care what's involved. I don't care whether it's the Governor's package or whoever's package. I think at this point in time, for any of us... for any of us to be less than to treat any Member less than.. in a manner less than they would



want to be treated themselves, to me, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this House has gone a long way down tonight... a long way down in the nine years that I've been able to stand here on this House floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Speaker's agrees with you wholeheartedly. Representative Grossi."

Grossi: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary question. I believe many of us really do not understand the effects of what we are about to do. We'd like an explanation from the Parliamentarian to fully explain what the consequences of our actions are at this point."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I thought by my 'no' vote I would be killing all of my colleagues legislation, I would not vote that way. But I think all of us know Bill by Bill we could give leave and use the attendance Roll Call. That takes about 15 seconds and we can hear all these Bills that you want to. I don't want to kill anybody's Bills. I think I've got four of my own that would die. Frankly, I believe that nobody would be hurt, even though I think they're very good Bills. I think some of you have heard me talk about the consultant's services contract Bills. However, I think that we can...we can keep on moving. We can do the business of the House. But the other issue means so much to so many of us that's why I'm voting for the blanket motion voting 'no'."

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

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I first came to the Illinois House in January the 10th I met 176 other people up here. One of the people who have been the most fair and the most honest with me is the Gentleman



who's made this motion. He has allowed this motion to be separated, divided. He's allowed for the exclusion of the Senate Bill that people have been concerned about. He's bent over backwards to help out in every way he can, as he has done since January the 10th. Like the other people who have spoken, I've got all of my Bills out and I've got a bunch of trash up for my State Senator as well. And I think that we owe it to the people that have some substantive Bills and some packages left to give it a 'yes' vote. Not only for those substantive packages, but also for the Gentleman who has made this motion, who has treated I think everybody in this room equally and fairly all the way along and he's portrayed that in an unbelievable manner I think this evening in allowing this motion to be split, in allowing this.. the question to be divided. And even vote to the point to exclude from his motion Senate Bill 1072 which is probably of the most importance to him tonight. And I think that he ought to have the vote up there to carry the motion tonight."

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

Bowman: "Yeah, an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. We keep talking about the exclusion of Senate Bill 1072, but how about the.. the Bill that caused all the controversy in the first place, House Bill 2348? What.. Where is that with respect to this motion? In or out of the motion? House Bill 2348."

Speaker Redmond: "It's a House Bill I guess. Is it 2348?"

Bowman: "Yeah. Would that come from the table if this motion prevailed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Bowman: "Senate.. Senate Bill 1072 would remain on the table, but House Bill 2348 would come off the table?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's a Senate Bill. It's not tabled. House



Bill 2348.. then it's tabled."

Bowman: "Then the Repre... Then Representative Lechowicz's exclusion of Senate Bill 1072 is moot, right? I mean it doesn't mean anything."

Speaker Redmond: "It what?"

Bowman: "Well, then Representative Lechowicz's motion to exclude 1072 which is a Senate Bill has no meaning because it's not on the table anyway. Right? I mean, I think we ought to know what we're voting on before we close the Roll."

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't suspended Rule 68 to consider it."

Bowman: "Wait a minute. I'm getting all sorts of..."

Speaker Redmond: "As I understand it, it would.. it would take 2348 from the table. Is that correct?"

Bowman: "234... Would the Gentleman..."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 2348."

Bowman: "Well, okay. But House Bill 2348 comes from the table along with all the others. Right?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, in explaining my 'yes' vote, I don't quite understand what the fuss is about. We heard from Representative Deuster when we were voting on the motion to table the motion to strike the enacting clause, that he and his.. people who were voting 'no' along with him were engaged in dilatory tactics. He told us that he thought it was important to protect the minority from the majority of this House. He was afraid that 89 votes might be put together for a package he did not favor. I thought that was the wrong way to go about expressing his opposition to a road program. Right now, we're after.. I'm a newcomer here but I understand that after midnight on June 30th any-



thing we do requires 107 votes. I don't understand exactly what you're fussing about. There are important Bills, important substantive Bills that were on our Calendar that were involved in Conference Committees that we were going to be asked to vote about, Bills like the reorganization in the Department of Conservation. Bills like 1377. I have a little Bill that would permit the Industrial Pollution Control Financing Authority to go on extending its authority to .. to businesses and industries that are involved in pollution control projects. I don't see why it is everybody wants to kill our capacity to deal with the people of our district sent us here to do which is to run State Government. And it seems to me 107 votes is a lot of votes and those of you who felt that you wanted to protect the minority and therefore wanted to prevent even any discussion of a road program have more than made your point. Senate Bill 1072 is, as the Parliamentarian told us, still alive. Can't you please give us a chance to hear the Bills that we're supposed to be hearing in this House?"

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

Satterthwaite: "To correct the misinterpretation of the previous Members... Member who spoke, the distinction as I understand it is, that anything voted upon after midnight June 30th needs 107 votes to be immediately effective. The question will not be in regards to the immediate effectiveness of the substantive Bill and therefore, substantive Bill could pass with only 89 votes and go into effect a year hence. That's what we're trying to avoid, the abuse of that situation. And it only applies in the terms of appropriation Bills where we're trying to fund an agency where we cannot afford to have that one year wait that we have to hold



out for 107 votes so that that can go into effect immediately. I hope that will be of some clarification to the new Members and if I am inaccurate, I hope someone will clarify it."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 89 'aye' and 74 'no'. The motion fails. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, just to edify the group, those that haven't been around a long time, I can assure you that anything substantive is not going to be considered by the Senate. They're in the process of tubing everything that's over there now that's of a substantive nature so don't have your hopes up even if you could suspend the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Am I correct that that motion failed so all those Bills are still tabled?"

Speaker Redmond: "Right."

Johnson: "Well, would it be in order to make a substantive motion of all the substantive..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think what we ought to do now is go to the appropriations and then probably repair to our respective homes."

Johnson: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "The first one is House Bill 2578. Representative Peters. Peters, 2578? Representative Campbell?"

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. This morning when I came into this House previous to ten o'clock, one of your Members from the other side of the aisle had to have nitro glycerin tablet. Not only that, but he had to have another in order to get up to the nurse's station. For the last three and a half to four hours we haven't done a damn thing in this House other than simply establish a Calendar. And I simply want to tell you that I don't



want to be a part and parcel of a group to cause people like John Vitek to have another heart attack. I've been through that. I'm not worried about me. Because I'm going to live through it and I'll stay here till doomsday with the rest of you. But I'm damn sick and tired sitting here listening when everybody's temperment and everybody's mood is not to do anything. And I think that it is time to recess this House and go home and get a good night's rest and get back here tomorrow and proceed with the business of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll do that very shortly I hope. Representative Peters, 2578. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, simply to explain. We fully understand the attitude just expressed by Representative Campbell. However, we do have a few Bills where a simple motion to nonconcur or to refuse to recede will enable us to take those Bills into a Conference Committee so that the Conference Committee will have already been created when we come in tomorrow morning which will greatly facilitate and expedite the conduct of our business tomorrow. So if the Members could please be patient for just a few minutes, allow Mr. Peters to make the appropriate motions on his Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with leave of the Chair and the House, I ask House .. concurrence to House Bill 2578 Conference Committee report #1. This legislation has to do with the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Health. We had discussed this previously. The Conference Committee has added the 100 thousand dollars that the Representative Darrow was concerned about. I would move passage now, Mr. Speaker, of Conference Committee report #1 to House Bill 2578. Final passage of this Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "You move the adoption of the Conference Committee report, is that correct?"

Peters: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's... Any discussion? Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me if I was not mistaken and I don't think I was, that I just heard the Majority Leader say that you were going to act on Bills to create Conference Committees. Now this Bill is talking about accepting a Conference Committee report and I think, if I'm not mistaken, there's quite a bit of difference between nonconcurrency and forming a Conference Committee than accepting a Conference Committee report. I say to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, if any of the new Members don't know what's coming off down here, you'd better wake up and find out. Because they're going to look around. The Leadership will have had everything that they want and all of you, each and every one of you, will be told to go home and cool your heels."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Take it out of the record then. I thought that we could take these appropriation matters and... On the Order of Nonconcurrency on Supplemental Calendar #2 appears Senate Bill 580. Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to nonconcur... not to recede and for the appointment of a Conference Committee report. I think I've done this already once tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman.... The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to Senate Bill 580. Those in favor... Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I thought we were doing this only with appro-



priation Bills? This does not appear to be an appropriation Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "They tell me we've already done that, so I'm working from a stacked deck. Okay. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk kindly correct the Board as a Senate Bill? And I believe that matter has been taken care of."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what they tell me. What's.. Which one's the one? Senate Bill 578, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Thank God."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "You're welcome. You're welcome. Proceed."

Oblinger: "I move that we refuse to recede from Amendments 1,2,3,5, and 8 to Senate Bill 578."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Lady's motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendments 1,2,3,5, you said 7. I only show 8 on here. Eight. All those in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the House refuses to recede from Amendments 1,2,3,5, and 8. Conference Committee will be . Been requested, is that correct? Now what have you got? 157. Representative Gene... E.M. Barnes. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, did we move 580? Are we going..."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that was done before."

Ewing: "Well, that was my understanding, but I just wanted to be sure so that we don't hang up on that tomorrow. It is an important..."

Speaker Redmond: "I know it. It has been done before."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "E.M. Barnes. Representative Barnes on 157? Out of the record. How about 851.. 891? Repr-



Representative Ryan, is that correct? Representative Ryan? 891? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to refuse to recede from the Senate Amendments... er I mean the House Amendments. Clerk, read those Amendments, Mr. Speaker?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments #1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10, 11, 12,13, 14,15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 38, 45, 53, 56, and 65."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan moves that the House refuse the recede from Amendments 1,2,3,4,5,6,8,9,10,11, 12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,22,24,38,45,53,56, 65. Those in favor of the motion say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried and the House refuses to recede from those Amendments and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all I want to thank Chuck Campbell who did come to my aid this morning and also I think he learned something that the pills that he carries in his pocket are three years old and any pharmacist will tell you that those little nitro pills are dated and I advised Chuck. He'd better check with his pharmacist and get rid of those. And coming from an old Czechoslovakian stature of my Grandfather, lived to be 102 and with modern science I hope to live that long too and I'll stick with you guys as long as you want."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just to indicate unless the Democratic staff persons list shows different, ours.. our list indicates that there are no more motions to be made in terms of the Senate Bills. We have concluded that action with the exception of 157 which Representative Barnes took out."



Speaker Redmond: "That's correct as far as we can see with my divided Calendars here. Representative Madigan. That's all I guess. Eleven o'clock? Twelve o'clock? The problem is the later we come, the later we stay, but twelve o'clock. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the mood seems to be for 12. 11? 12. I move that we adjourn till twelve noon."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that we recess until twelve o'clock tomorrow. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's' have it. Representative Collins, ascend the podium and you take care of the business. "



| | | | |
|---------|-------------|------|-----|
| HB-0014 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 120 |
| HB-0229 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 22 |
| HB-0265 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 25 |
| HB-0292 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 219 |
| HB-0580 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 121 |
| HB-0672 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 47 |
| HB-0751 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 122 |
| HB-0838 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 123 |
| HB-0909 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 124 |
| HB-0921 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 51 |
| HB-0925 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 120 |
| HB-0956 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 20 |
| HB-1010 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 43 |
| HB-1019 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 125 |
| HB-1255 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 27 |
| HB-1272 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 230 |
| HB-1564 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 25 |
| HB-1763 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 26 |
| HB-1804 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 44 |
| HB-1901 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 52 |
| HB-1914 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 25 |
| HB-1970 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 54 |
| HB-2034 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 28 |
| HB-2168 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 24 |
| HB-2348 | MOTIONS | PAGE | 247 |
| HB-2376 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 52 |
| HB-2377 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 19 |
| | MOTIONS | PAGE | 18 |
| HB-2378 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 17 |
| | MOTIONS | PAGE | 17 |
| HB-2750 | CONCURRENCE | PAGE | 45 |
| HB-2787 | 1ST READING | PAGE | 8 |
| SB-0289 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 45 |
| SB-0362 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 83 |
| SB-0375 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 232 |
| SB-0490 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 75 |
| SB-0578 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 346 |
| SB-0580 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 208 |
| SB-0587 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 208 |
| SB-0588 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 213 |
| SB-0807 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 222 |
| SB-0811 | CONFERENCE | PAGE | 227 |
| SB-0891 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 347 |

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 30, 1979

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------|------|-----|
| SB-0905 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 105 |
| SB-0971 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 214 |
| SB-1150 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 216 |
| SB-1183 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 239 |
| SB-1217 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 105 |
| SB-1238 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 55 |
| SB-1272 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 217 |
| SB-1277 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 56 |
| SB-1342 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 64 |
| SB-1377 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 85 |
| SB-1386 | NON-CONCUR | PAGE | 65 |
| *HJR-0013 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 3 |
| SJR-0029 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 9 |
| SJR-0064 | 3RD READING | PAGE | 13 |
| | MOTIONS | PAGE | 13 |

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 30, 1979

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

| | | |
|--|------|-----|
| SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER | PAGE | 1 |
| REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER | PAGE | 1 |
| REP. SIMMS - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE | PAGE | -1 |
| ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE | PAGE | 1 |
| AGREED RESOLUTIONS | PAGE | 15 |
| ANNOUNCEMENTS | PAGE | 117 |
| MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE | PAGE | 118 |
| APPROVAL OF JOURNALS | PAGE | 118 |
| BLANKET MOTION TO SUSPEND RULE 68-F | PAGE | 278 |
| ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE, PAST MIDNIGHT | PAGE | 290 |
| REP. ROPP - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE | PAGE | 290 |
| CLERK LEONE - PRAYER | PAGE | 290 |
| MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE | PAGE | 302 |
| BLANKET MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES 63, AND 68 D & E | PAGE | 318 |
| HOUSE RECESSED | PAGE | 348 |