

1.

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

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members, please be in their seats. We will be led in prayer by the Reverend Barge, Westminster Presbyterian Church in Springfield."

Reverend Barge: "Let us pray. Almighty God, source of all wisdom, you have plans for us and power to make them happen. We ask your blessing upon the Legislators, Executives and government workers of the state. Give them the knowledge of your will for the world. Help them always to remember that they serve a public trust beyond personal gain or glory. May they see that no government exists for itself alone, but is responsible to you for justice and for the well-being of all your children. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevec, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriation I, which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 22, 1978, reported the same back with the following recommendations: do pass Senate Bill 1577, do pass, as amended Senate Bill 1595."

Speaker Redmond: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: Senate Bill 2619, together with Amendments passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Journal for the 149th Legislative Day. Monday, June the 19th, the House met pursuant to adjournment, Speaker in the Chair, prayer by Reverend Arthur Koch,



First Congressional Church of Springfield, by the direction of the Speaker the Roll Call was taken to ascertain attendance of the Members....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, do you have a motion with respect to the reading of the Journal?"

Clerk O'Brien: "149th Legislative Day."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have your usual poop sheet, but I would move to suspend the reading of the Journal that the Clerk is now reading."

Speaker Redmond: "149th...."

Madigan: "And that it would be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. The question is on his motion. All those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. The reading of the Journal is dispensed with and the Journal is approved. Representative Madigan, are there any Democrats whose absence should be excused?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Kornowicz is excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objections, the record will so show. Any Republicans whose absence should be excused?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Totten seeks admission to the floor of the House. Mr. Speaker, Representative Totten seeks admission to the floor of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Objection has been raised. Would you... Representative Matijevich, his seat is right back here. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 2632."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2632. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 and 22 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this one out of the record as the request of the Sponsor. House Bills, Third Reading."



Representative Ryan, are there any Republican whose absence should be excused? Any Republicans whose absence should be excused? How about McBroom? Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Did you and the Minority Leader say I could be excused and vote proxy, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

McBroom: "Did I understand that you and the Minority Leader said I could be excused today."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I thought that was what he was going to suggest, I don't know."

McBroom: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 1089."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1089. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Business and Economic Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. 2739, Representative Ryan....out of the record. 3071, Representative Younge....out of the record. 3128, Representative John Dunn, out of the record. 3276, Representative McBroom. 3276. Out of the record. 3319, Representative Madison, out of the record. 3384, Representative Harris, out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence. House Bill 157, Representative Stiehl.... out of the record. House Bill 15....oh, Representative Stiehl, pardon me. Your aide suggested that should be taken out of the record, Representative Stiehl. Your aide, right in front of you there. You can't see me because Representative Griesheimer is standing up. O.K., Representative Stiehl, on 157."

Stiehl: "Monroe....Monroe, do you want to go with the concurrence"

Speaker Redmond: "Constitutional Amendment 54, Representative Flinn. 157, Representative....who's going to do the honors? Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker....thank you, Mr. Speaker...."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 157. All the Senate Amendment does was....is mandate the Illinois Institute of Environmental Qualities to conduct a study, rather than the Department of Mines and Minerals, because it was felt that they had the facilities by which to do it. I would ask for approval of this Senate Amendment and ask that the House do concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we don't have the file on this Bill yet."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Madigan: "We do not have the file on this motion for concurrence. Would you take it out of the record?"

Speaker Redmond: "You want this one out of the record? 158, is it the same problem with that one? Take that one out of the record. 1470.....out of the record. 2549.....Representative Williams, are you seeking recognition? How about 2549, is that Representative William's....is that correct? O'Brien, sit down. Sit down. Representative Williams, for what purpose do you rise?" Representative Williams."

Williams: "Well, mine was the next Bill up...2597, I'm ready for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh. Representative Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to ask you to use your power to stop that Mr. DiPrima from intimidating our poor Chairman of Appropriations II."

Speaker Redmond: "2549, Representative DiPrima. Please, come to order. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we don't have this file, either. Would you take this out of the record?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2597, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



of the House. House Bill 2597 was amended with my concurrence in the Senate, Senate Amendment #1 cleared up the issue, nothing herein shall be construed to prevent high school districts from the transportation of public or nonpublic elementary school pupils on a regular route. And Amendment #2 was a technical Amendment that clarifies the intent that this is permissible if the route is safer, more economical and more efficient. I move to concur in the Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2597."

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

Brady: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Brady: "As I understand these Amendments, what it will allow is only for elementary private school students to be bused within the school district and for for public elementary school students. I think in its present form, although they think it is technically correct, will cause a constitutional problem and throw the situation of busing any of those students up in the air, Representative Williams."

Williams: "No, that question came up in the Senate Committee and they feel that this language actually will take care of it and it says nothing shall be construed to prevent either the transportation of public or nonpublic elementary school pupils. I think the question was whether...and it should be clarified, whether it was O.K. for the mix of...actually kids from the high school and the grammar school to be on the same bus. This just says it's O.K. if the route is more economical and safer and more efficient."

Brady: "I'm sorry Representative, who said it's okay?"

Williams: "They thought this language should be put into it to show the intent that it's O.K. if you mix the high school and the elementary school pupils on the same bus... whether they be public or private school students."

Brady: "Would you agree to change it, Representative, to make



it not O.K. that you mix the elementary and high school kids- together?"

Williams: "Well...it's a....I put this on because the Senate Education Committee thought that it should be on there. I have no objection to it and it came as a question fromI believe we have a letter here from Superintendent 'Markwick,' that thought this language...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite....Representative Houlihan and Collins, will you please sit down?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of information. Has this Amendment been circulated? I can't find it."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the Amendment been printed and circulated, Mr. Page?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Representative Williams. I would urge that you....that you change your motion, Representative, and nonconcur so that we could get together and do a separate function because I don't feel that what we're setting up here in mixing the elementary and high school students in both the private and public sector, is going to be to the advantage of the children who are being transported throughout school districts. I think it's a mistake to try and lump second graders in with sophomores in high school. And I would urge that if you don't change the motion I think I'd oppose it at this time and would hope that the Members would oppose concurrence in this."

Williams: "If I may speak to that, actually, we have two Bills ...yeah, the next one coming up does not have this Amendment and it was felt that we should have the one Bill with this Amendment on and then the other Bill without the Amendment on. And then let....when it gets to the Governor, the office there will decide if....you know, this had to be in there, it's in there and if not then they have the other Bill which they can sign."



Brady: "Representative, I don't mind the Amendment where you're placing the parochial students in with the public students. What I do mind about the Amendment is mixing the elementary and high school and I think we could change that Amendment and send it back. And I would urge that that is done and on this basis would urge nonconcurrence with this motion."

Williams: "Well, I believe that the only change from what is in the statute right now, I believe it says it's O.K. to transport public elementary and high school students and this just added really in there, or nonpublic."

Brady: "We have an opportunity to do something good here, Representative, that's all I'm saying."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to respond to Representative Brady's objection, there are several school districts in the suburbs, several elementary districts, where they do not provide bus services because the schools are within one and one half miles of every available student. And so the parochial school or private school students who live more than one and one half miles from their school have only available to them the high school busing system. Now, the only thing, if we do not pass this, the Office of Education, as I understand it.... it has raised the question in one district in particular, where they have said that the high school may not pick elementary students up from private schools. What this Bill attempts to do with the Amendment, the Senate Amendment, is to permit those high school districts where there are no elementary schools, there's no public elementary school busing, to permit the high school buses to pick up the elementary kids. If we do not have this, then those private school elementary students who live more than one and one half miles from their homes would have to walk. There would be no alternative....alternative, due to the objection raised by the Office of Education. Now, there



is another Bill, Representative Brady, sponsored I believe by Representative Schlickman, which answers the problem that you raised. I would urge support for Representative William's concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think....I know that Representative Brady has a very, very valid point. However, I think at this time, I would like to see us concur with the motion as Representative Williams has proposed. In our area, generally speaking, the elementary students are transported at a different time on school buses, but as Representative Walsh said, there are occasions and places where the elementary students do not have a separate bus. And so, rather than have them not transported, I think in those cases this would permit the transportation....or the transporting of the private elementary students along with the high school students. I think that we should concur with this and also keep the other Bill in mind and if it does a little more directly what Representative Brady would like to see, well then naturally, we can go with that also."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise in support of concurrence. We have this very identical situation in my school district and I think that this would certainly alleviate a situation that could be bad. So, I would urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams, to close. Representative Bluthardt, pardon me."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge concurrence. I think that when we passed House Bill 2597 we thought we had accomplished what we wanted to and apparently we didn't so this Amendment was attached to it



in the Senate and really, all it provides is that the prohibition in the Act shall not be construed to prohibit a high school district from transporting public or non-public elementary school children. Really it's not a mandatory thing, it's optional on the part of the high school districts and I would urge that you do concur in the Amendment."

Williams: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2597."

Speaker Redmond: The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2597. 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 is 104 'aye', 28 'no' and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2597. 2605. Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. It simply changes the effective date to January 1, 1979 to conform with the tax year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yes, would the Gentleman please explain what this is all about other than what the Senate did to it?"

Levin: "Currently, if a corporation does not file its personal property tax inventory, a 50% penalty is added to the assessed value of the personal property. This has a... you know; has a number of very adverse consequences with respect to bond ratings and tax collections. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2605. 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 144 'ayes' and 2 'no' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2605.



2648, Representative Reilly. Representative Keats, two things.....sit down and second thing, in your own seat. Representative Giorgi, will you please come to the podium? Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2648. All the Bill does is direct the Department of Administrative Services to have to sell a piece of surplus property in the City of Jacksonville at auction. The Senate added an Amendment on which directs that...which says that the proceeds of that sale must be spent on a specified piece of equipment for the Illinois School for the Deaf in Jacksonville. I certainly am not one to oppose an expenditure of funds for that school. There are two things wrong with that. One, is that the Amendment is meaningless, it does not do what it purports to do. You would have to amend the Finance Act and do several other things to actually require that. Second of all, it seems to me it establishes a very bad precedent for saying that all the proceeds from the ...any place that we sell must go back to that institution. They ought to go through the normal state appropriation process and this Amendment by wording, at least, would try to get around that. So, I ask that the House do not concur in this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Gentleman's motion, I believe he's totally accurate and that we ought to non-concur with the Senate Amendment. I think it begins a terrible precedent and I hope that we do do it on a voice vote and we nonconcur."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers."

Byers: "Don't we just get leave for a Conference Committee?"



Speaker Matijevich: "Right. The.....I got here late, but I understand the motion....."

McClain: "The motion is to nonconcur."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly from Morgan, to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2648. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill....on the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 2661, Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 2661. The changes which the Senate made are entirely technical changes. In one instance, the word employer was used when the word employment agency should have been used. Another....at another point, the word him was used when employment agency should have been used. And there is another technical correction in regard to the \$75.00 figure. So I would ask for your concurrence with this technical Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman, has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2661. On that motion..this is final passage....allthe Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think you just made the point I wanted to make. This is final passage. This is the recorded vote on this Bill and it seems to me that the movant ought to explain not only what the concurrence is, what the Amendment was, but ought to explain the effect of the entire Bill. I hope the Members will do that in the future."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, on a point of order."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. It's always been a tradition of the House, in fact it's not even our rule, that the movant has to explain the Amendment. It's always been a tradition that the movant explains the Amendment. But



if we're going to open up the whole can of worms on the Bill again...that's never been a tradition in the House and I think the Gentleman's suggestion is probably well intended, but it sure would take an awful lot of time and that's my point."

Speaker Matijevich: "The point is in order. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, the point may be in order, however, I think that the Members of the House are entitled to the courtesy of knowing the content of the Bill that we're voting on since this is final action. And that is the one that is the official Roll Call vote and I think Congressman Porter's suggestion is just fine."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, in closing, I will surely be more than happy to try to respond to the concerns that have been voiced. The Bill was introduced as a result of an investigation by Chicago's Channel 7 of a child beating incident. An employee who was sent by a domestic service agency beat a child so seriously that that child will have lifelong problems because of it. I have worked with the Department of Labor. The Department of Labor supports the Bill, the association representing the employment agencies supports the Bill and the Bill responds by providing some assurance to individuals and families who employ individuals provided by insurance agencies that they will be protected."

Speaker Matijevich: "To make the point of order clear that Representative McClain made, so that we don't get into that on every Bill, the maker of the motion only has to explain the Amendment that is up for concurrence. The Lady from Cook has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2661. Those in favor of that motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 111 voting 'aye', 16 voting 'no'.



8 voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2661. House Bill 2671. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kempiners: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "State your inquiry."

Kempiners: "I think this follows up on what Mr. Daniels was pursuing with regard to this one Bill that just passed. However, I caught the last part of your ruling, which was that on a concurrence the only thing that the Sponsor would be required to explain is that...was the Amendment under consideration. And I was wondering when we're taking final action on the Bill, as Representative Daniels pointed out, we ought to be aware of the full context of the vote that we're casting...and I would like you to reconsider that ruling that you just made."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Parliamentarian tells me that we should not be going into the merits of the Bill as it has already been approved by the House...but, the Bill as it has been amended by the Senate Amendment. And I think that is in order."

Kempiners: "Well then, Mr. Speaker, is there anything out of order with a Member who would like to know what is in the rest of the Bill, standing up and asking that information from the Sponsor...."

Speaker Matijevich: "There's nothing wrong with it, but when a point of order has been raised the Chair has got to respond to that point of order. House Bill 2671. Representative....the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671. House Bill 2671, as it was passed by this House, was identical to House Bill 2597 which we previously acted on this morning. In the Senate an identical Amendment was



offered to each of these two Bills. That Amendment strengthened the concept that if a public school district is to provide transportation by separate routes to non-public school students, that the separate routes shall be more....safer, more efficient and more economical. This Bill does not contain the other Amendment that deals with the transportation of nonpublic grade schools by public high schools. I move, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we concur with this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671. On that motion, is there any discussion? Being no discussion, this is final passage. All those in favor of the motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671 shall vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 137 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2671. House Bill 2685. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2685 is like the Bill that we passed last night to extend the deadline on the circuit breaker and the Senate Amendment is the one that includes the past years, back beyond 1976. I urge your adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, has moved for the concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2685. On that issue....on that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor is absolutely correct. This Bill is absolutely identical to the Bill we passed yesterday....the Senate Bill which we sent to the Governor. I think this gives us an opportunity



...if we send this Bill in its present form to the Governor, he's got no choice. They are both identical. He'll sign one, he'll veto the other. I would point out, again, the incongruity of the Senate Amendment which allows senior citizens to apply for back years, '73, '74 and '75, but only through September 30 of this year....so that if the Governor takes any time at all to sign the Bill, the senior citizens are not going to be able to get the benefits of the back years. I would suggest that this Bill go to a Conference Committee so that it can be amended to change the date to December 31, 1978... so that the senior citizens can have a meaningful period of time, at least to the end of this year, to apply for the back years. There is also going to be an awful lot of confusion if there are two different dates. If you have until the end of this year to apply for 1976 circuit breakers, but if you only have until September 30 to apply for '72 to '75....I suggest the fact that there are two Bills, it gives us the opportunity to send this to conference to amend it so we can have more meaningful legislation for the senior citizens. And I urge that we non-concur in this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, to close."

Pullen: "I simply ask for a favorable vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen, has moved that the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 2685. Those in favor of that motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 118 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the Senate....the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2685. House Bill 2775. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes. Out of the record. House Bill 2790. The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword....out of the record. House Bill



2839. Is Representative DiPrima here? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima, on House Bill 2839."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2839."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima, has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2839. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I'd just like to know, roughly, what the Amendment and Bill will do."

Speaker Matijeich: "Would you yield to a question, Representative DiPrima, he's like to know that the Amendment does?"

DiPrima: "I'm trying to look for it, I...it does nothing, actually."

Speaker Matijeich: "It does absolutely nothing, are you satisfied? Hold it...it deletes everyting after the enacting clause."

DiPrima: "This gives an account of who the Governor appoints...let's see, 2 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President and 1 Member appointed by the Senate Minority Leader, 2 Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 Member by the House Minority Leader and 3 public members to be appointed by the Governor. And that's it...nothing. The Chairman shall be designated by the Governor or from the two members he appoints."

Speaker Matijeich: "Are you satisfied, Representative? The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I would strongly urge the Members of this House to support that in keeping with the precedent we've established here. It sounds good."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima, has moved that the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2839. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 138 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the House does ...



concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2839. House Bill 2945. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the two Senate Amendments onto House Bill 2945 did two things. The second Amendment had an effective date of the first day of the month after the Governor signed the Bill into law. And the first Senate Amendment included the University of Illinois cooperative extensive program employees. Within the definition of an employee in the State Employee Group Insurance Act, the Amendment was recommended by the Department of Personnel and is of a housekeeping nature. The existing definition of employee is limited to persons who participate in the various public employees retirement systems. These extension employees are entitled to participate. According to the department this was an error at the time that the definition was drafted. Therefore, it's a clean up and that they would now like to correct it. These people in the department say that this Amendment will not result in any additional expense to the system, since that right now the system is including them even though the definition does not specifically include them...that...therefore, the housekeeping. And I would move to concur with the two Senate Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty, did you want to be heard on this? Your light is on. No. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, has moved that the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Mahar and I are the two Cosponsors of this thing and we don't know what the two Amendments are. I wonder if the Gentleman would take it out of the record so that we can find out whether the



the original supurb purpose of this Bill has been outweighed by whatever the Senate Amendments are."

McClain: "I just explained them, but, if....."

Skinner: "You know, when you're talking about pensions, a little change in a Section ends up costing a hundred million dollars, maybe."

McClain: "Now you much be confused. Bill Mahar's a Chief Co-sponsor with this Bill...this is not a pension Bill, this is insurance. You must be getting this confused with another Bill."

Skinner: "I understand what the orginal one is, but I'd sure like Bill to understand what the Senate Amendments are. Could you explain them to him again?"

McClain: Fine, I'll pull it. Nothings going to die in the meantime, We'll pull it."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll take this Bill out of the record. House Bill 3351. Is Representative.....the Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl on House Bill 3351."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do not concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 3351. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Amendment is a conveyance of land from the Department of Conservation to the Oregon Park District in Ogle County. Now, the Department is in support of this. But the problem is, there is a technical error in the Amendment and the Senate Sponsor has agreed he'd like to have it back there so that they can clear up the technical Amendment and then get the Bill passed. And I would ask that the House do not concur."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl, has moved that we....that the House does not concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3351. There's no discussion. All those in favor of the motion to nonconcur, say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the House does not concur with



Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3351. House Bill 3372. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, on House Bill 3372."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the clean up Bill for the Legislative Reference Bureau. Some 380 pages....and it developed, there was a mistake in one word and I think that's a compliment to the people in Enrolling and Engrossing and Legislative Reference Bureau. That's all that the Senate Amendment did is change this one word which was an error."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, has moved to concur....that the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3372. Those in favor of the motion to concur shall vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Final passage. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 150 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 11 voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3372. House Bill 2945, which was just taken out of the record, we return to that. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've talked to Mr. Mahar and Mr. Skinner and they now are fully informed on the two Senate Amendments. And I believe they have removed their objection, so....I've already explained the Amendments, I now would move to concur with Senate Amendment....."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, has moved to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2945. Those in favor of that motion shall vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 159 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present' and the



House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2945. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 23, 1978, reported the same back with the following recommendations: do pass House Bill 3288, Senate Bill 1710 and Senate Bill 1841."

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 238. Senate Bills, Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 238. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Senate Bill 238, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Could you take that out of the record for the time being?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 252. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen. Out of the record. Senate Bill 253. Out of the record. Senate Bill 255. Out of the record. Senate Bill 309. Out of the record. Senate Bill 386. Out of the record? Out of the record. Senate Bill 388, out. Senate Bill 293, out. Senate Bill 395, out. Senate Bill....Oh, you want to hear it. Senate Bill 395. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 395. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like leave to bring Senate Bill 395 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of tabling one Amendment and adopting another one."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman from DuPage....asks unanimous consent to bring back Senate Bill 395 to the Order of Second Reading, does he have leave? Senate Bill



395 is returned to the Order of Second Reading."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute. Amendment....what Amendment are we on? Oh, all right."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like leave to table Amendment #2, which is included in Amendment #3. So I'd move to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage.....I think you want to withdraw 2, one....."

Hoffman: "Right. I'd like to withdraw 2."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #2. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan....Brady? Brady."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I think I'm a little confused, I don't know if everyone else is. Is Amendment #2 an Amendment that has already been added to the Bill or is it just being offered today and withdrawn?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Offered and withdrawn."

Hoffman: "Offered and withdrawn....withdrawing Amendment #2 that has not been offered, yet....it's on....been filed and adopting 3."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does that satisfy you, Representative Schneider. (sic) All right. Does he have leave to withdraw Amendment #2? Leave....further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 395 on page 1, line 21 and so forth."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Amendment #3 clarifies the issue...."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you rise?"

Satterthwaite: "I'm simply trying to find the Amendment. Has this Amendment been circulated?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been....has



not been distributed. No, it has not. Do you want to hold?"

Hoffman: "All right, hold it. This would be Amendment #3, right? All right, if it has not been circulated, then just hold it on Second Reading until it is distributed and we'll get back to it."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll hold it and get back to it. Senate Bill 395 will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Senate Bill 554. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, on Senate Bill 554. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 554. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, on Senate Bill 554."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 554 amends the Pension Code. The Bill amends the Chicago Municipal Employee's Retirement System....Article of the Pension Code and provides for establishment of service credit for members who served as council of the Chicago Welfare Administration. The Bill requires that the member would pay both the employer and the employee costs of the service credit, therefore, there would be no increase in liability to the system. In addition, Senate Bill 544 has a number of Amendments of.....provisions that have been passed previously by the House but were either delayed or de-enacted out of the rules of the Senate. All of these Bills, as I say, have been passed by the House previously. The Amendment provides that the....that allows the Chicago Labors and Annuity Benefit Fund to participate in the Chicago Employees Municipal Credit Union. Presently, the credit union does not allow participation because of the assignment exclusion. This has been approved by the Pension Laws Commission and there is no clause for this provision. Also, it amends the State Employees Retirement Article, permits members



who have previously accepted refunds of its contributions to reestablish service. We passed a Bill last year and because of the two year service requirement they were left out of the program. The State Employees Retirement System is not taking any position. The consulting actuary to the Illinois Pension Laws Commission has recommended approval. Again, there's no cost on this Article. Also, it amends the Judges Retirement System. We have....it clarifies the language to the widows and survivors section of the Judges Retirement System. The Amendment was recommended by the Board of Trustees of the Judges System in order to clarify the eligibility of a surviving child who is dependent who... for a physical or a mental disability, if he or she is beyond 18. This simply clarifies the provision since we cover children under 18 and over 18 if they are disabled. The cost on this is approximately \$30,000 annually. And again, has been approved by the Illinois Pension Laws Commission. The provision also amends the reciprocal Article of the Illinois Pension Code. It amends and strikes language which excludes pension credits under the reciprocity were granted. This of course, has been approved by the Pension Laws Commission. There is no cost on this item, as well. We also amend the State Employees Pension System, amending the Social Security Enabling Act. It's a recodification Bill, the first recodification in 25 years and again, is approved by the Pension Laws Commission. And it will save the system a substantial amount of money under the Social Security Act. The Amendment also provides to grant parity between the Members who have service credits under the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund Article and members who have service credits established under the six various Cook County pension systems. This has also been approved by the Pension Laws Commission. Over the last 10 years....it puts them on parity with Members covered under IMRF. In the last 10 years there has been



\$144,000. \$953 transferred into the...by the IMRF System. If you divide this among the six systems and divide it by the ten years that they have enjoyed this benefit....it would amount to approximately \$2,416.00 per year for each system. And I would urge support of Senate Bill 554."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich has moved for the passage of House Bill 554. On that the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "I'm just looking here in the digest, I haven't had a chance to look this over, Representative Terzich...but, I know the Senate Amendment #1, if this is correct, deletes the revision from 600 to 1040 as the number of working hours per year required for participation. Do I understand....does that mean that it used to mean you had to put in at least 1040 hours a year to be eligible for participation and this is going to be cut down to anybody who puts in 600 hours a year?"

Terzich: "That has been taken completely out of the Bill, Representative Wolf. It is no longer in the Bill. It was taken out by Senate Amendment #1, which is the Bill."

Wolf: "O.K., but originally the Bill would have only required 600 hours a year to be a participant."

Terzich: "That is no longer the Bill, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Is there a fiscal impact statement with this?"

Terzich: "Yes, I have filed a fiscal impact and I covered all the fiscal impact in my explanation of the Bill."

Wolf: "How much was it?"

Terzich: "There was \$30,000 on the Judges' portion of the Section and \$166,000 for each of the six systems."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion....the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, has moved for the passage of House....Senate Bill 554. Those in favor



vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Senate Bill 554.
 Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?
 The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from McHenry,
 Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Well, I had a question that might have influenced the
 outcome of this vote, but it obviously won't now. I would
 like to know if there's anything in this Bill that is going
 to guarantee the RTA Board Chairman a \$50,000 a year pension.
 He indicates there isn't."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk will take the record. The
 on this Bill there are 126
 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'nay', 14 voting 'present' and
 Senate Bill 554 having received the Constitutional Majority
 is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 771. The Gentle-
 man from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in a point of order."

Speaker Matijevich: "What is your....state your point."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when I came
 to the floor this morning, I opened my desk drawer expecting
 that I wouldn't find the rule book after what happened
 yesterday. It was a pleasant surprise to see the rule
 book there, I thought we had thrown them all out. But
 the rules do exist I guess, Mr. Speaker, and there is a
 rule that provides that no literature shall be distributed
 on the floor of the House on a Member's desk. And I find
 on my desk today, Mr. Speaker, a communication under date
 June 23, 1978, to the Members of the House from the Illinois
 State Medical Society, under the name of Don Udstun. I
 respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, the next time you see
 Mr. Udstun, you chastise him for violating the House
 rules."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'd do more than that to him."

Schlickman: "May I join you?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You sure can....and your point is well
 taken."



Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Your point is well taken, I feel very strongly about that too. The....Senate Bill 771...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 771. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 771 is a Bill which will make a Class I felony....certain courts of conduct of indecent liberties. That is, where a person uses minors, under the age of 16, photographs them and reproduces the pictures....solicits a minor under the age of 16 for that purpose or is a parent or legal guardian of such a person and knowingly permits such action. In addition to that, it was pointed out to us by the director of the Youth Division of the Chicago Police Department, a problem that is going on in the City of Chicago where young people, under the age of 16, are being solicited for sexual acts. It is under our present Act... an affirmative defense to a crime of indecent liberties if a person under the age of 16 years accepts money. So it is virtually impossible to successfully prosecute someone who pays a 15 year old to have sex with them. This would remove that as a defense to the act. In addition to that, by Amendment in the House, we have provided that it will be a Class X offense if your home is invaded by a person who knows that you're there and comes into that home while armed with a deadly weapon or while you are there and he comes into your home....attacks you in your dwelling place. I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that truly if there is one place in which the people of Illinois ought to be able to feel secure, it is in your home. And it is certainly, at least, as serious an offense as an armed robbery...if a



person comes into your home with a knife or a gun or comes into your home in a burglary and assaults you. And I suggest that this sort of offense, this class of conduct, should be made a Class X offense and at the same time we will be striking a blow at child pornography and at problem that we face in the City of Chicago with child prostitution. And I would ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 771...and on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure we all concur with the basic concepts of this Bill. But of particular significance to every homeowner in this Assembly, is the Amendment which has been added to it, that of making a Class X penalty of home invasion when armed with a deadly weapon. Historically, and I repeat, historically in terms of Cook County and this may apply to the entire state, most heinous crimes occur during a home invasion. Many heinous crimes occur during a home invasion...burning, mutilation and even murder. There's a second effect, a psychological effect to an entire neighborhood. We have come to presume that our homes are our castles. Immediately upon being...home invasion occurring in the neighborhood, no one can feel safe in that community. The entire concept of a man's home being his castle is violated. I concur with this Bill and the Amendment and I solicit your vote."

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

Leinenweber: "I have a question for the Sponsor, if he'll yield."

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

Leinenweber: "Representative Getty, under your Bill as amended here in the House, is it still a Class X felony under the following circumstances; I invite someone into my home, hypothetically, of course....."



Getty: "No. No, it's been amended. Representative Johnson offered an Amendment and it takes that situation out of it as was pointed out by yourself and Representative Darrow and Representative Johnson in Committee...and we have amended that out."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment very briefly on this Bill. As the Sponsor points out, it covers two vastly different areas. And I think, certainly, the Bill on child pornography....I did feel was a good one when it was up last time and somehow it didn't quite make it through, so that aspect of the Bill is fine. What we find extremely interesting is that the second portion of the Bill, that making the crime of home invasion a Class X felony, is apparently a recognition on the part of the Democratic Party and their candidate for Attorney General, of the wise move of this Legislature in having a Class X felony at all. That was quite an issue last time and lots of people said we shouldn't have Class X. But this is a recognition that we should have Class X and these particular heinous types of crimes should be called Class X. So this is a definite change in the right direction on the part of the other side of the aisle. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Getty, one question in regard to the original purpose of this Bill. I basically agree with it, but I wonder, have you been able to deal with the subject which only recently came up in the Chicago court....the Cook County court, when as I understand it, the first trial of someone convicted under the child pornography....which was a very gross case, was given probation rather than any form of jail sentence. Do you have a mandatory jail



sentence built in here to cover the situation for our weak-kneed judges are not taking the direction of the people of this state as given to them through the General Assembly?"

Getty: "The Legislation which did make it through last year, unfortunately, only made this course of conduct a Class III offense. That is corrected. It becomes a Class I offense, in line with all other indecent liberties.... offenses. And I think that's the way it should be, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. Speaking to the Bill and supporting this Bill most strongly, both phases of this Bill are very fine Bills. I especially commend the Sponsor for the original nature of this Bill. To all of you who read the Chicago newspapers and those of you who do not see them because you are in central or southern Illinois, a deplorable thing took place in the City of Chicago not too long ago when a judge, after a full trial and conviction of a man under one of the provisions of the child pornography provision, was given probation. We have an ongoing problem in this state. We pass laws trying to make the punishment more strict for people that obviously violate the basic status of our society and our weak-kneed judges again let them walk out on the streets so that they can go right back to the same position. I know there's nothing we can do with the judiciary, but I hope that the public takes from Mr. Getty's Bill, the strong urging of this House of Representatives and the Senate that we do not do this and that if the judges are not willing to put teeth into our laws as we've given it to them, then they ought to get out of the judging business and go back to attempting to practice law."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."



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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Representative Getty, does this have anything to do with the laws on indecent exposure?"

Getty: "No, this is an Amendment to the Indecent Liberties Section and it also creates a separate class offense for home invasion. Indecent Exposure is a separate Section of Chapter 38."

Friedrich: "Well, we have a matter pending in our area where the attorney for the defense says the laws on indecent exposure are not clear at all, and in his opinion, you can stand in your front door and.....O.K.....even though minors are involved....."

Getty: "That Section of the statute is not subject to any Amendment here. I think I'm familiar with the case and the claim raised and, Representative, there's nothing to do with that here. It wasn't addressed, it may be necessary, but it has nothing to do with this Section."

Friedrich: "I would invite your help in amending that Section next Session. Thank you."

Getty: "I certainly would join you in doing so."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's a flash in the pan. The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Do I understand, Representative, under the present Bill which had originally started with the deceptive practices and was amended out I take it.....under the present Bill, what your Bill will do with the two provisions....the one provision will actually tighten the laws against the child abuse of children with pornography. Is that right?"

Getty: "Absolutely. If the synopsis which you have in front of you has something to do about deceptive practices, that was totally stricken in the Senate. The Bill addresses itself to two problems only and that has to do with indecent



liberties and home invasion."

Geo-Karis: "I take it then that Senate Amendment #1 which was tabled was redrafted in order to make it technically correct and still provide the child....the abuse for child pornography is what it amounts to. Right?"

Getty: "That's correct, Representative."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly would like to commend the Sponsor, both the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor, for their fortitude and their foresight because the way this Bill has been amended....has been really very well done because it's high time that we stop the abuse of children to pornography....other elements and conduct. It's high time we protect children and it's high time we protected people from being invaded in their homes by brutal people who commit other crimes once they go there for the most part. And it's high time that we passed a meaningful legislation that will really instruct our State's Attorneys not to take pleas, negotiated pleas, so quickly and then blame the judges for it. I think it's high time we recognized that the judges can only do what they have in front of them and if cases aren't properly prepared, they can't act too well and hold someone. Therefore, I support the Bill and urge everyone else's consideration."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, has moved the previous question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, to close."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill, I believe, may be one of the most significant Bills of this Session in substantive law change. We are, indeed, taking a positive step forward in tightening up our laws relative



to indecent liberties with a child and child pornography. In addition to that, we are taking a substantial step forward in reacting to an expose by the Chicago Tribune concerning the prostitution of small children and the fact that we can't get convictions on people who lead children into prostitution because they accept money and then that is an affirmative defense. In addition to that, this Bill will meet another very grave problem that we have seen just in the last several months....where homes have been invaded, where a 77 year old minister was brutally assaulted in his home and in all probability the most serious offense that was committed by those people was a Class II or a Class III felony. This will become a Class X felony. We saw, just a month ago, that an assistant editor of the Chicago Tribune whose home was invaded, his daughter was being attacked in her bed by a man with a knife, he came to her rescue, was severely stabbed....the most serious offense is probably a Class II, possibly a Class I. This will make that course of conduct the most serious, Class X. We want people in Illinois to feel secure in their homes. And I ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 771. On that motion, those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explanation of my vote, as was mentioned during floor debate, this is a Bill that started out in the Senate dealing with deceptive practices. It was then amended at Second Reading to deal with the subject of indecent liberties with children and then here in the House it was further amended to deal with the matter of home invasion. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while technically it may not be, I think in spirit, it is a violation of the constitutional



requirement of three readings in each House, dealing with a different subject matter. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, believing that this kind of practice leads to bad legislation, I vote 'present'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 159 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay', 5 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 771 having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 825. The... Representative McGrew, is he here? Senate Bill 1055. Representative Hoffman, is that out of the record? No. TheSenate Bill 1055."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1055. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to return Senate Bill 1055 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage has asked leave to return Senate Bill 1055 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? He does have leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 1055 on page 3, line 5 by deleting 11 and so forth."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 increases the size of the Advisory Council Education of Handicapped Children...is part of the series of Bills on 94-142 which you have been receiving correspondence on. We increased the membership from 11 to 15 and included an additional handicapped person as well as a representative of a private provider. And we have also added the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation because of their involvement in the 'Swept Program' to the Advisory Council. And therefore, I move the adoption of Amendment #2."



~~Speaker Matijevich:~~ "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1055. Is there any discussion? All in favor of the adoption of Amendment #2 say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. Are you ready with 395 now or has that been distributed?"

Hoffman: "That Amendment, I don't believe, has been distributed."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Senate Bill 1395."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1395."

Speaker Matijevich: "Dave Jones, are you ready with Senate Bill 1395? Out of the record."

(Continued on Page 35)



Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 1419."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1419. A Bill for an Act to revise the law governing local government in school elections to implement the consolidation of elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, on Senate Bill 1419."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1419 is substantially the same as House Bill 2554, which we passed out of the House some weeks ago. It's the implementation Bill for the consolidation of local government elections. What it does is implement the consolidated schedule that we enacted some time ago. The Bill provides the election procedure in the Election Code for administering in the odd numbered year elections and for the submission of propositions or referendums.... the various election...regular elections. What we've done, as you know, with Senate Bill 1419 is substantially the same that we did with House Bill 2554 as it relates to the Amendment and a desire to satisfy all those that had certain concerns. The House Bill, as I understand it, that is now in the Senate has presently attached to it a one year extension date for the effective date of the Bill. As you know, I did, as I promised the Members of the House when we passed 2554 out...that I would amend it in the Senate to provide for a two year delay of the effective date. That Amendment was put on in the Senate Committee and on Second Reading in the Senate was reduced to one year. Senate Bill 1419 does have the two year delayed effective date and I would ask for your favorable approval of Senate Bill 1419."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1419. On that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 1419 for the reasons just stated by Representative Yourell. Those of us that believe in consolidation of elections believe the time has come to implement this...this system. There is nothing in House Bill 2554 that requires any further delay



in this much needed and much desired consolidation principle. The people have asked for it, they are sick of going to the polls continually in special elections. The cost of elections is soaring and the time is now to consolidate elections. We have worked for seven years to bring this principle to fruition and this House acted positively on House Bill 2554 and passed it with an effective date of December of 1978. That is ample time to work on any problems that may exist but I say to you, I don't believe the problems still do exist. The only problems that exist are in the minds and the evil hearts of certain lobbyists who represent the Illinois Municipal League. They have obstructed this Bill. They have lied to every...the Members of this Body. They have lied to members of their own organization and I say it's time to throw it back in their faces and implement this legislation as we originally contemplated. I would beg...implore every Member of this House to vote 'no' on this Senate Bill, 1419, and then when House Bill 2554 comes back for concurrence refuse to concur and go back to the original effective date of 1978. The only purpose of this two year extension is to...defeat the concept of consolidation of elections. They hope that some of us will not be back in the next Session of the Legislature and then they hope that they will be able to repeal this much needed and much...needed and required and requested principle of consolidation of elections. This is a fraud, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A fraud that you are being asked to perpetrate upon the voters of your districts and of the people of the State of Illinois. I implore you, turn down this fake, this fraud, beat this Bill and then get the House Bill back in its original state and we will..... We will not only consolidate elections but we'll do it on time. There is absolutely no argument in favor of this Bill except to destroy the concept of consolidation of elections. Please, don't be party to this murder."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson."



Robinson: "I agree completely with the remarks just made by Representative Collins. When this Bill... When the original Bill, 2554, went through the Elections Committee, went through this House, there was ample chance for Amendments. It was debated in Committee on three occasions. It was held on the House floor on Second Reading for ten days to two weeks. This Bill moved through very quickly, there was little chance to really examine it, either in the Elections Committee or on the floor. If you are really for consolidated elections, vote 'present' on this Bill. Let's bring it back for Second Reading, let's amend the effective date and make it a real consolidation of elections Bill. If you are committed to organizations that want consolidation of elections, if you've talked to people in your district and said you will vote for it, don't vote for 1419 in the state it is in now."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise in support of House...Senate Bill 1419. I think one of the problems that many of us have had with this Bill is the fact that there are still some unanswered questions. And while the Municipal League is being used as a whipping boy, I don't think they should be used as a whipping boy, there are other local governmental agencies such as school boards and park boards and library boards, that have had a lot of questions about the Bill. This is a very, very important Bill. It's changing our entire election machinery in the State of Illinois. While consolidation of dates is one thing and that's favorable, the manner in which these...in which the Bill is going to work is very, very important. This will give the local governmental people who have to implement this Bill an opportunity to look at it and then they can't come back to us and say, 'Well, it will have to be changed, it's not going to work.' This is an opportunity for this legislation to go on the books and let the local governmental entities look at it and make their request for changes and we can do it in an orderly normal fashion and then we will have a consolidation of elections we can be proud of. I urge you to support Senate Bill 1419."



Speaker Matiejvich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm just sorry that there's an emotional feeling between...and a clash between the Municipal League and Phil Collins. I think he's making this a personal issue and I hate to get up and speak against Phil Collins but I am in support of this Bill for more than one reason. We've been told a dozen times that it took ten years to think this Bill out. Now, I want to correct another statement that Phil Collins made... That those that are against consolidation of elections are trying to scuttle this Bill by passing this one. Let me tell you, and I've said it repeatedly, I said it the last time I got up and spoke on this Bill, I've got consolidation of elections in Elmwood Park. I've got consolidation of elections everywhere it works... But there are seven municipalities in one township, whether it be Leyden or 30 townships in Cook County that have overlapping districts... that have over...The Mosquito Abatement District runs into two different towns. There are two fire districts that run into three different towns. There are three college...there are two high school districts that run into seven towns. This is going to cause utter chaos if you're trying to implement 900 pages of implementation by...in the next two or three months. You're going to cause nothing but a problem to Stanley Cusper who's going to have control of these elections and we're going to have nothing but complete chaos. I am for it and I hope that the emotional feeling between the Municipal League and Phil Collins doesn't kill this Bill. If we want consolidation of elections and we're really sincere about it, give us the two years to work these problems out, let us find out how to implement this, let us make sure that we do go into an election that we don't have a major, major problem and certainly there's going to be an awful lot of school districts...park districts that are going to get hurt if the implementation of this Bill is not properly thought out....of. I beg you to pass this Bill."

Speaker Matiejvich: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."



Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill in the shape that it's now in is the very thing that we fought against in the House Bill and managed to keep out of the House Bill to give us consolidation of elections in the State of Illinois. This is what the people have been asking for. Everywhere you go they say, 'We're having too many elections on too many days and we want election consolidation.' I talked to election officials... some election officials in my area and asked them, 'Can this work?' And they said, 'Sure it can work.' And your...it's only going to work when you confront the problems that are in it and solve the problems, and we can solve them under the Bills as they now stand. This is only a delay in an effort to give a long death to consolidation of elections in the State of Illinois, because in two years they will have found some more problems and they'll say, 'Oh, you can't solve them unless you give us two more years.' And in two more years they'll say, 'Oh, there's some more problems... And they won't be solved unless we do it before you put this into effect, give us two more years or four more years.' It's the death knell of consolidation of elections if we pass this Bill in the shape that it's in now. The only way to meet these problems is to meet them head on with a law that says we're consolidating and now you go at it and work at it and make it work and it can work under the way that it is presently constituted without the delay. I urge you to vote 'no' or vote 'present' on this Bill."

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

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill with the two year extension on the effective date is absolutely necessary. It is supported...the two year extension is supported by just about every major Sponsor of the Bill except the...my former roommate, the mad Irishman from Calumet City, who refuses to realize that there are serious problems in the implementation. Even the chief draftsman of this Bill has admitted to me that it's necessary that the extension be put on there and that it would



be preferable to have a two year extension rather than a one year because we would want the...the implementation and the consolidation to take place during municipal elections rather than during a general election because considerable confusion is anticipated. And it would work better in the local elections than in the general election. The...Sponsor recognizes, the chief draftsman, I say again, recognizes the necessity because there have been a number of election Bills passed through this House in the General Assembly that have to be integrated into the implementation Bill. There are also a number of codes...the School Board Code, the Municipal Code and other codes that have to be put into the machinery. We can anticipate maybe 6, 7, 800 more pages of implementation that have to be considered and put into the Bill to make consolidation of the elections possible, feasible and workable. I guarantee you this, I promise you this, that if I am back here and there is any effort to kill consolidation of the elections I will certainly oppose it because I've come about to the point where I want consolidation of elections. But I want consolidation of the elections that will be workable and not be a total mess when we try to put it in prematurely. I would urge you to vote 'yes' on this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, has moved the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly understand how my good friend and colleague, Representative Collins, feels about the delayed effective date. We have talked about this on many, many occasions. And those of you who recall the debate on House Bill 2554 know that there were 23 or 24 Amendments put to the Bill and Representative...the Representative who spoke from Sangamon County, who indicated that House Bill 2554 was held on Committee for many, many days while everybody had an



opportunity for input and consultation on the Bill, is absolutely right. Those of you who recall the two Amendments, House Amendment #10 and House Amendment #15, that were put to this Bill by Representative Mahar which were the delayed effective date Amendments, recall that the vote on the one was 75 to 75. It was that close and because of the tie vote the motion died and the Amendment was not adopted. I can tell you that I did not want, originally, the delayed effective date. I have counseled with the township clerks, I have counseled with the city village municipal clerks, all of who...and county chairmen and county treasurers and everybody that's concerned with consolidation of elections and they agree now, and I have not had one objection, not one objection to the delayed effective date because they agree, as I agree at this point in time, that in order to pass this most important Bill that will implement the two Bills that we've already passed... House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session and 1978, which was the consolidated schedule, this Bill must be passed. The Taxpayer's Federation supports this legislation, the Illinois Municipal League supports this legislation now and all of the organizations that I know of that are concerned with the consolidation of elections are now in support of this Bill with the delayed effective date. And I guarantee you as I guaranteed every Member of the House when House Bill 2554 was being debated, that I will do everything that I possibly can within the next two years to see that the implementation is the proper way to proceed for the consolidation of elections. The time has come now for the consolidation of elections and its companion Bill, the implementation Bill and I solicit your favorable vote on Senate Bill 1419."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1419. On that motion, those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well here's one objection that the Representative who sponsors this Bill is going to hear. There are always going to be unanswered questions about election laws. That's the way of election laws."



But let me tell you what the basic unanswered question is, will this... and this is basically from school districts and park districts and that is, will immediate consolidation of elections limit our ability to raise taxes? What we have here, Ladies and Gentlemen, is a question of tax eaters versus the taxpayer. Now maybe some of you haven't heard what happened in California. The taxpayers won. Well this Bill preempts...this Bill preceded Proposition 13. This is our answer to Proposition 13, it's to give taxpayers the ability to vote on issues. Now what you're saying is you're going to let your local school districts sneak through the referendum the week before Christmas or the Saturday before the spring primary election, as occurred in my district this past year. You're going to continue to let them do it. I don't think that's responsible and that's why I'm voting 'no'."

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

Bowman: "Well, I think, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that the Representative who spoke in favor of this would lead us to believe that the...the local clerks are going to have a difficult time implementing this. Are they to have us believe that they're incompetent clerks? Or that they simply can't cope or that they don't know their jobs well enough? We have a pretty good clerk up in Evanston and I'm informed by her that she would have absolutely no difficulty in implementing this with the effective date that we provided for 2554. I think that we ought to defeat this particular legislation and go with 2554."

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

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A previous speaker mentioned that we should pay attention to the taxpayers who want to save money. Well in my municipality the elections are going to go from 5,000 dollars to 25,000 dollars and I am paying attention to those taxpayers. I really would like to compliment the Gentleman from Cook, the Chairman of the Counties and Townships Committee on handling this legislation. And I would like to point out to you all that shotgun



marriages very seldom work and we need a two year cooling off period. Please, vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 128 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 1419, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1562."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1562. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act providing for the enforcement by the Department of Public Health of certain state and local food handling and health regulations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Winnebago, Lynn Martin, on Senate Bill 1562."

Martin: "I would ask leave of the House to bring this Bill back to Second Reading?"

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Winnebago asks leave to return Senate Bill 1562 to the Order of Second Reading. Does she have leave? She does. Second Reading."

Martin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you recognize Representative Tuerk, please?"

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd ask leave of the House to table Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1562."

Speaker Matijeich: "I didn't hear you, I had something else coming up here."

Tuerk: "I asked for leave of the House to table Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1562."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Peoria ask leave to table Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1562. Does he have leave?"

Tuerk: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also ask leave of the House to withdraw House Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1562?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Did he have leave?"

Tuerk: "I further asked leave to withdraw House Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1562."



Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to withdraw Amendment #6. On that, the Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not speaking on the Amendment. I was just wondering about the procedure we just followed. That was 4 who had been adopted, hadn't it, on the floor of the House by vote? Wouldn't you have to reconsider that?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendment #4, I understand now was a Floor Amendment and it was adopted on the floor. So the proper motion is to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #4 was adopted. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and #4 is reconsidered. Now does he have leave to withdraw Amendment #4. He does have leave. Now, on Amendment #6, is it? Amendment #6....does he have leave to withdraw Amendment #6? On that, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question on both of these? Fred....I'm sorry, I'm just checking back?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Go ahead."

Mautino: "They look like they are both substantially the same Amendment. Why are you taking the regulations off of counties with population of 500,000 or more?"

Tuerk: "Well, we'll get to that in a moment with Amendment #7 and then I can explain that then, Dick."

Mautino: "O.K."

Tuerk: "What I'm trying to do is...Amendment #4 and Amendment #6 which was to be offered, are in conflict. I'd like to get those off and then offer Amendment #7 at the appropriate time."

Mautino: "Is the extension of time still on this legislation with these Amendments removed to 1980?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I've just been told that Amendment #7 hasn't been distributed, so....that we do it all at one time, why don't we take this out of the record. All right? All right. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1570. Senate Bill 1570. Read the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1570. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, on Senate Bill 1570."

McAuliffe: "I'd like to ask leave of the House to take it back to Second Reading for the purpose of adding two Amendments?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has asked leave to return Senate Bill 1570 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of adding Amendments. Does he have leave? Leave is.....Senate Bill 1570 is returned to the Order of Second Reading."

McAuliffe: "Amendment #1....."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, McAuliffe, amends Senate Bill 1570 on page 1, line 8 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McAuliffe, on Amendment #1."

McAuliffe: "Amendment #1 would add \$59,000, it was taken out in the Senate. The money would go for secretaries for the Justices of the Court of Claims and for the Administrator of the Court of Claims...his salary."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1570 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, McAuliffe, amends Senate Bill 1570 by deleting line 30 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McAuliffe, on Amendment #2."

McAuliffe: "Amendment #2.....the House passed House Bill 2714 which eliminated the funds for the Court of Claims and this Amendment would just reinstate the funds. It comes from general revenue and the road funds."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1570. Is there any discussion? All in favor of Amendment #2 say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Amendment #2 is adopted. Third Reading."



Are there any other Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1605, Houlihan. Out of the record. 1605 is out of the record. Senate Bill 1630."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1630. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Telcser....1630....out of the record. Senate Bill 1680. O.K., just a minute. Senate Bill 1680 is out of the record. Senate Bill 1785."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1785. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the assistant Majority Leader, Representative Lechowicz, on Senate Bill 1785."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1785 provides that maintenance and repair to residential real estate shall not increase to property's assessed valuation. The residential property must be owned and used exclusively for a residential purpose. Maintenance and repair work is defined in the Bill as.....it does not increase a square footage of improvements, it does not materially alter the existing character and condition of the structure, but is limited to work performed to prolong the life of the property with existing improvements or keeping in.....the property in a well maintained condition. Representative Skinner, just the other day, asked as far as the application of the Bill as far as the residential home property....I told him at that time that there was an opinion from the Attorney General and I withdrew the Bill from the record because I did not have a copy of the opinion. But I do have it now. And that was the Attorney General's opinion number.....S 1045, where it states that the first question is whether the Homestead Improvement Exemption is



applicable only to owner occupied residency. The statute applies only when property is owned and used exclusively for a residential purpose. Under this language it is clear that the Homestead Improvement Exemption applies only to owner occupied residences since all property is in fact owned by someone....any other construction would render the word owned meaningless. I discussed this with Representative Skinner. I showed him the Attorney General's opinion. I know of no objection to the Bill as it is written now and I would ask for your favorable consideration on Senate Bill 1785."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1785. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Would the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Porter: "Ted, when if ever, did repairs and maintenance cause an increase in assessed valuation? I thought that only capital improvement would previously have effected that and I thought that we were now on a fair market value basis anyway."

Lechowicz: "No, John, maybe you don't recall but in last Session of the General Assembly we excluded downstate counties under House Bill 2195.....in that category. And it was limited at that time to a ten year period with a maximum dollar amount of \$7500. Now, under Senate Bill 1785, this would eliminate the dollar amount on maintenance and repairs. And it would also provide this measure statewide."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise and I know futilely to oppose the Gentleman's Bill. I do so because the Bill, in the first place, is meaningless. Maintenance and repairs do not increase assessed



valuation anyway, as a rule. But where they would and where the repairs might be so extensive as to appreciably increase the valuation of the residents, then it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the assessed valuation ought to be increased for tax purposes. Because if you don't, then you put the burden on the people who do not have the money to make these improvements. Unless you reduce expenses, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, then somebody is going to have to pay. And to exempt a select group who happens to have money enough to make extensive enough repairs so that the assessed valuation or the valuation is increased seems to me to be ridiculous. It is counter-productive, it is counter to what we really ought to be doing. We ought to be providing tax relief for everyone generally and the only way you can do that is by reducing or causing expenses to be reduced at every governmental level. And the other thing, if we're going to provide tax relief, we ought to do it for those people who need the tax relief....and that is through the circuit breaker, Mr. Speaker, it's not through the Homestead Exemption. And I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill came to Committee I suggested that it only applied, at that particular time, to Cook County. And I suggested to Representative Lechowicz, who agreed to accept an Amendment, to include downstate. I said I didn't think it was fair to have a limitation of \$7500 over a ten year period for downstate and unlimited for Cook County. And he agreed to do this...and it was done. But I do want to tell you that the purpose of this type of legislation is to encourage people to keep their homes up and to improve their property. And I can tell you that when this is done downstate, particularly from some of the



windshield inspections that have been made pertaining to assessments and so forth, that they certainly have increased the value...or increased the assessed valuation. and this will give protection and encourage people to do that. And I think it's a good Bill and I ask you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the previous Speaker from Vermillion County hit the nail on the head. The purpose of this Bill is not to reduce the tax base, there's no reduction in tax base. All we are saying by this Bill is that should a homeowner maintain his property and keep his property up without any capital improvements...but maintain and repair it, he should not be penalized by being assessed a higher valuation while the people who let their property run down, don't take care of their property, let it deteriorate...they're rewarded by either the same or a lower assessed valuation. My gosh, we're talking about people's homes here. And people that maintain and repair their homes are not the ones we want to penalize, they are the ones we want to recognize. The people that should be penalized are the people that let their homes in some of our urban areas run down so that the whole neighborhoods decay and so that the assessed valuation, the tax base of that neighborhood or area declines. Here, we cause no decline, we cause improvements. It's a good Bill. The previous Speaker from Cook, the former Minority Leader or whatever he was, said he's for the circuit breaker...well, I haven't seen him vote for any circuit breakers this Session. He's not listening now...but I haven't seen him vote for any circuit breaker relief this Session and even on the tennis court he doesn't mention the circuit breaker. The Gentleman from Vermillion hit the nail on the head. Let's help those who repair their property and who keep up their property by not penalizing



them with higher assessed valuations. I support this Bill. It passed the House Revenue Committee. It's a good Bill and we should enact it into law."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schuneman, on Senate Bill 1785."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Schuneman: "Ted, I'm curious to know what might be considered repairs and maintenance as opposed to capital improvements. For example, in an old home...if you put in a new bathroom fixture, would that be repair and maintenance?"

Lechowicz: "Repair and maintenance, under the Bill, is defined as work that does not increase a square footage of improvement and does not maturely alter the existing character and condition of the structure, but is limited to work performed to prolong the life of the property with existing improvements for keeping it in a well maintained condition."

Schuneman: "So do you think putting in a new bathroom fixture would be repair and maintenance?"

Lechowicz: "No, it would be....new roof, new gutters, siding, storm windows....."

Schuneman: "Pardon me, I didn't hear what you said."

Lechowicz: "New roof, gutters, siding, storm windows....."

Schuneman: "New furnace?"

Lechowicz: "Pardon me."

Schuneman: "New furnace?"

Lechowicz: "No."

Schuneman: "No what?"

Lechowicz: "No new furnace."

Schuneman: "Well....are you saying that would not be repair and maintenance?"

Lechowicz: "Of the existing structure."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak with the Bill."

Lechowicz: "Well let me just point out to the individuals that a new furnace is not used in the reassessment procedure on any home."



Schuneman: Mr. Speaker, can I speak to the Bill. I'm not..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "I'm not in disagreement with what I think the original concept may be, but, I think of the possibility of buying a home which needs a new kitchen and it needs a new furnace....and it needs a new bathroom and needs a new roof....and I can see people buying homes for the explicit purpose of avoiding the taxes that they would have to buy....have to pay if instead of buying the older home, they bought a new home in which the taxes would be higher. And I think that we may be creating something here that would create a substantial tax break to a certain group of taxpayers and that's what I'm concerned about. And I'm not sure that I've really gotten the answers that I've been seeking."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian, on Senate Bill 1785."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a little surprised and disappointed that Members of the Revenue Committee, first of all, passed this Bill out. But more importantly, why the don't really say it as it is. This Bill is flimflammy. Representative Walsh was right. This Bill will probably pass because it is called tax relief. But it's not only a meaningless Bill, it is unenforceable. Just imagine yourself to be a township assessor or a county assessor and say the quadrennial comes along and you inspect the property which is supposed to be on the basis of market value....how can you determine what part of that market value, if there's an increase, is the result of a new paint job three years ago or trimming the hedges two years ago. I can't see....I can't imagine how anybody could operate under this kind of statute. It's flimflammy and it's nonsense, but I know we're in the silly season. When it comes to offering taxpayers relief, I think we're always in the silly season. This doesn't do the job and it..... not only that it invites corruption and the making of deals



with assessors. Because all you have to do is go to the assessor and say, 'look, you gave me a \$3000 increase but I had a paint job on the house, I trimmed the hedges and I did a few other things and that's where that increased value goes and therefore you can't raise my value'. Now that leaves a great deal of discretion on the part of the assessor. And it's just a kind of Bill that doesn't make any sense at all."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matula, on Senate Bill 1785."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Matula: "Mr. Sponsor, if I own a single family dwelling home, but I did not live in it, I rented it out and I did some work, would I have to be assessed for that work or would I be benefited and just.....not be assessed for that extra work?"

Lechowicz: No, unfortunately the Bill calls.....you've got to live within the structure."

Matula: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hoffman, on Senate Bill 1785."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just rise to echo the comment of Representative Walsh and Representative Mugalian. Because if we look at this Bill, the aspects of enforceability are such that it is practically impossible. Interestingly enough, the provisions for the filing of affidavits will probably not result in a great deal of tax loss because most people won't know about it. So, it seems to me that the description given to us by Representative Mugalian is correct. It's flimflammy. It's a mirage which...in terms of what it will do for the taxpayers is probably not great...but the threat that it poses to local units of government are such that they will be put in some very difficult positions and the assessor will never be able to be right when he makes assessments. I would suggest to you that if you



want to deal with meaningful tax relief in this Session, which I think we need to, and to deal with it consistently and fairly for everybody in this state, regardless of where they live is that we need to look at the assessment level of 33 1/3% and reduce that level to some lower number. We are in the process of preparing to propose that we move that level of assessment down to 29 1/2%. We have looked at this relative to the taxpayers, relative to schools and relative to the impact on state government. And I would suggest to you that this is the direction that we ought to move rather than looking for holes and cracks that we can use as an excuse for dealing meaningful with ...with tax relief. And so for the reasons I've mentioned, I stand in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Antonovych, on Senate Bill 1785."

Antonovych: "I would like to speak in support of this Bill.

And I would like to ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have been speaking against the Bill to reconsider their position. Now, you may live in newer areas, the suburban areas, and they have the luxury to look back and pick at loopholes that may or may not materialize as an effect of this Bill. However, I am speaking for older neighborhoods, older architecture, which to give you an example, there are many buildings in my district which may be worth \$40,000. Now, as an action of government when you have various building code violations and fire violations to tuck point a house, repair a roof, you may have construction costs totaling about 15 or \$20,000, which would be half the cost of the present valuation. Now, when you have neighborhoods on the verge of falling apart and becoming blighted areas or you have some positive attitudes coming from government grant programs and the community groups that are encouraging rebuilding of existing neighborhoods and preserving the social structure that exists there.....I think we've...the state government



should give those groups and those well intended people all the support we can. Therefore, please vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Tipword, on Senate Bill 1785."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question be put. So...the question being, will the main question be put? All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion carries. Representative Lechowicz, to close."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that Senate Bill 1785 is a very critical Bill. And I don't believe it's flimflam...when you're talking about maintenance and repair work of every residential home in this state. If a person applies his own money and yes, maintains that property, repairs it and tries to maintain the level of living to the best of his standards...and yes, this Bill would provide that the assessor could not make a reassessment based upon the maintenance and repair work that has been done on that structure. This is an immediate tax relief for every residential homeowner in this state. Now, if you want to go on record and state that you are opposed to this proposition, Senate Bill 1785, you may do so. But if you're talking about an area of....in the urban areas of this city...of Chicago and the rest of this state, this is a very critical piece of legislation. I listened to Representative Campbell and the Revenue Committee...and yes, they understood his concern about the existing law and a limitation of \$7500 for a ten year period downstate and this Bill was amended to bring into consideration of the rest of the residential people of this state, to provide equitable justice for all....all the individual homeowners of this state. The Bill does require that you have to be



a resident within the structure. It does require that you cannot make extensive changes, additions to the structure on square footage basis. I believe it's fair and I believe it deserves your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1785 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis, to explain her vote for one minute."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I heartily concur with the Sponsor of the Bill because we are robbing people of incentive with the horrible tax structure that we have and I think it's a good thing and we will save some money. And I do hope my brothers and sisters on both sides of the aisle will consider giving us a lesser tax assessment rate than we've got because ...the other Representative was right too."

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

Bowman: "Yes, I'd just like to point....Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that in Cook County this really won't have any effect because right now, residential assessments are done by a computer program. And the computer program is designed in such a way that it only takes into account things like number of rooms, square footage and so forth. There is no provision for level of maintenance to be included in the set of variables that predicts the assessed valuation. So there won't be....in fact, there's no way even if you change your program, there's no way of getting that information without an actual windshield survey which would adversely triple or quadruple the assessor's staff and so far the assessor has been reluctant to do that. So this really won't have any affect on Cook County. I vote 'no'."

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



Skinner: "It won't take that long. I have a potential conflict of interest on this Bill and that's why I'm voting 'present'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 129 'ayes, 29 'noes', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed." Senate Bill 1630."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1630. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Telcser, on Senate Bill 1630."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, may I please have leave to take Senate Bill 1630 back to the Order of Second for the purpose of an Amendment?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman requests leave of the House to bring it back to Second Reading. Any objections? Second Reading."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to offer Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1630. You may recall, yesterday, Representative Dan Houlihan had some questions about our intent regarding Senate Bill 1630. This is an Amendment to satisfy his question. And what it does is clarify for sure, so to speak, that the original Act did not intend for the 120 day notice to be recorded. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also move the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1630."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? There being no discussion, the Gentleman moves that Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1630 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1786. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1847, Representative Daniels. Senate



Bill 1847."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1847. A Bill for an Act relating to product liability actions and product liability insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels, on Senate Bill 1847."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1847 is the companion Bill to House Bill 1333, which passed this House by 161 to 3 vote on May the 26th. House Bill 1333 is currently on Third Reading in the Senate at the present time and this Bill, basically, creates the statute of repose that was explained in great debate in the hearing of House Bill 1333. It's in identical form, it's a companion Bill and Representative Houlihan and I are the principal Sponsor of this and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Huskey, on Senate Bill 1847."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Huskey: "On House Bill 1847 (sic), if a replacement part.... your legal limits in your Bill is what....10 years, 12 years....of law suit?"

Daniels: "Yes, that's correct."

Huskey: "If a replacement part, other than a part that was manufactured the same as the original manufacturer is used, would the....tort start all over again?"

Daniels: "No, it would not if it's of the same design or formula."

Huskey: "Same design. But if it was manufactured by a different manufacturer of a different design, then the tort would start all over again?"

Daniels: "Well I think you're misusing the word tort, with all due respect."

Huskey: Well, I hardly know what the word means, that's a lawyer's word."

Daniels: "O.K. Let me see if I can tell you, basically, what



you're aiming at. What you are in essence saying, first of all, any manufacturer can manufacture the replacement part and it could be the same design and still run with the same Statute of repose as contained in the language. I think what your question basically refers to is what happens if a manufacturer redesigns or changes the design and formula on a replacement part, what is the statute of repose as to that replacement part. And in answer to that question, the statute of repose would be 10 years on the replacement part. And the reason for that, basically in this legislation it was felt that the new design ought to prove itself worthy and effective just as the original product design proved."

Huskey: "Let's say I had a Singer sewing machine and it was 9 1/2 years old and I replaced a major part of that machine with a different manufacturer....than a Singer and maybe of a smaller design probably to get away from the patents of Singer. Then this has a new statute of repose for another 12 years or 10 years from that time?"

Daniels: "Well, in answer to your question, first of all the manufacturer makes no difference. So that part of your question is, the manufacturer doesn't make a difference ...who it is, whether it's the original manufacturer or a new manufacturer. In specific answer to the statute of repose on a newly designed, different replacement part would be a 10 year statute of repose...on a new design."

Huskey: "But if it is a different manufacturer...he would almost have to change his design to stay away from the patent. Is that not right?"

Daniels: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that last part."

Huskey: "If it was not a....if it was of a different manufacturer, he would almost have to make up a different design to stay away from the manufacturer's patent."

Daniels: "No, not necessarily. Now there's another provision too. Just by the fact that you change this design doesn't



mean that somebody's liable for recovery under strict liability. And keep in mind that this Bill applies only to strict liability, it does not apply to negligence or warranty. In order to recover on a change of design that new design must introduce a new hazard into the product that wasn't there previously. In other words, the plaintiff must show in order to recover that the design was different and that the new design introduced a new hazard not existing prior to such alteration, modification or change in design."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Huskey, do you want to address the Bill at this time? Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I have to reluctantly....I certainly dislike opposing this Bill but I am forced to oppose it for the simple reason that....if I....I feel that this is a Bill that is a trial lawyer's Bill. I don't feel it's a Bill that will get to the bottom of our public liability in all aspects. I think it's a big business Bill. I don't feel it's a Bill that will help the small business. It's a Bill that if I had an automobile and Iit was 9 years old, I would have to go back....and let's say I had a General Motors automobile, I would have to go back to General Motors to make sure that I bought the identical part that I'm taking off of this car to replace it with in order for the statute of repose stay in order. It's a Bill that many of our manufacturers of small parts throughout the State of Illinois could be put out of a business. It's a deal...it's a Bill that would affect every retail and wholesaler that sells replacement parts or any kind of machinery....tractors, sewing machines, washing machines, irons or whatever. So, I reluctantly, have to oppose this Bill and I would ask for that...for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bartulis on Senate Bill 1847."



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

I too, reluctantly, stand here and have to voice my opinion against this Bill for the simple reason this is a lawyer's Bill as Representative Huskey has said and a big business Bill. This is just another way of harassing the small businessman which has been taking it on the chin from this Legislature for the last 15 years. And it does include....I'm talking about service stations, garages, auto parts stores and that type of business and they are just going to be put out of business by this harassment. And I would ask the people here today for a 'no' vote because this is a very bad Bill."

(Continued on Page 61)



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman on Senate Bill 1847."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when the House counterpart, 1333, was presented to this Body for consideration, it was stated that we should vote for it and not any...accept any Amendments on two counts. Number one, a deal had been struck in a back room by business and commerce on one hand and the trial lawyers on the other and that any Amendment would jeopardize that deal. And the Bill was passed on that basis, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Since then, all of us have been advised that interested parties, specifically, the Illinois Product Liability Task Force, Chicago Chapter of the Machinery Dealers National Association, the Automotive Wholesalers of Illinois, the Midwest Electrical Distributer's Association and several other organizations feel that House Bill 1333, as we passed it, and Senate Bill 1847, by virtue of Sections of 2(c) and 2 (e) are so offensive and dangerous to small business that they would prefer to have no legislation this year rather than this damaging legislation. Their specific concern, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is that Section 2(e) discourages the use of safer replacement parts. Presently drafted, it's detrimental to product users and to businesses which produce, sell and install equipment parts with a different design than the original equipment parts even though the replacement part is actually safer. Additionally, Section 2(c) of these Bills would make an unwarranted extension of the doctrine of strict liability in tort to cover businesses that perform services, an extension which the Illinois Court for public policy reasons have consistently rejected. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have another example in Senate Bill 1847 and its counterpart, House Bill 1333, in a deal being struck by some interested parties in a back room and then an attempt here on the floor to thrust them down our throats suggesting this is it, nothing else. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that the interested parties that I mentioned are correct, better that we don't have anything than this Bill. And I urge a 'no' vote."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Neff, on Senate Bill 1847."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1847 as it's been brought out here, I think is very unfair to the small auto dealers. I happen to be a new auto dealer. This would be an advantage if I was looking for something for myself, this would be a definite advantage for the new automobile dealers and also to the auto manufacturers because they can put out these parts and have no liability. And yet, we turn right around and maybe have a better, safer part put out by the independents and this is very true quite often and yet this Bill....this part will have to be....have a liability for 10 years. I don't think we're treating it fair. I think again, as someone else brought out here, this is hurting the little people, it's certainly not hurting the big people. And so let's keep in mind the consumer. The consumer is going to pay more for that part if we knock these little dealers out and they can't buy them..... these auto supply houses. Well, quite often they do sell cheaper than the original parts. Again I want to repeat, as a new car dealer, quite often the auto parts supply houses supply a better parts at a cheaper price...quite often than the new parts. Therefore it gives a saving to the customer and...again I repeat, let's don't do anything more to hurt little business. We done enough here in the State of Illinois and certainly if this Bill is passed we're gonna hurt these small business people. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Willer, on Senate Bill 1847."

Willer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say that I am not a businessman or businesswoman, I'm listening to the charges on the other side of the aisle saying that this is worse than nothing, it's a result of a deal in the back room. I would just like to share with you my own thoughts. I have received mail from businessmen favoring this Bill. Now, this tells me either the businessmen are



stupid and don't know what they're talking about or it is a good Bill. So I'm somewhat baffled by the statements. These are not giant corporations. They are small businesses in my own district who have been writing me saying please support this Bill. So I'm just sharing this with you and I'm really baffled by the Gentleman's comment across the aisle."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matula, on Senate Bill 1847. Matula."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Matula: "Mr. Daniels, you're speaking about new designs. What do you mean, vintage wise, when you're speaking about new designs? Can you please explain that to me?"

Daniels: "Are you speaking about a new design of a replacement part? I'm not sure I understand your term, vintage wise."

Matula: "How many years previously are you speaking of as far as new design is concerned...5 years, 10 years, 1 year, 1 month. In other words, you've been talking about new designs, new designs. Is this something that was designed last week, last month, last year or when?"

Daniels: "It would be a new design that's introduced into the product. The original product would have a statute of 10 years, state of repose of 10 years, once it's placed in the hands of the consumer. Using the example of an automobile, which is the one that is of concern here as some people have mentioned, there would be a 10 year statute of repose on that automobile when it's in the hands of the consumer. The consumer, in driving that automobile, if he drives it for 10 years time then the doctrine of strict liability would drop off of that automobile. And I emphasize, the doctrine of strict liability only. That doesn't mean that a plaintiff, if he's injured because of an original equipment faulty part ... like in the case of the Pinto automobile and exploding gas tank,



that that person couldn't sue under another theory. But that automobile before this law takes effect on any replacement part must be over 10 years old. So if you replaced a part in the 8th year with a part of a new design, a completely new or a different design, in the 8th year there would be a 10 year statute of repose on that replacement part. So in other words, it would have 2 years to run on the original product, making it 10 and remaining an 8 year difference there, you'd have to operate that automobile for a total period of 18 years. Now, Representative Matula, I suggest to you that there are not many automobiles that are on the highway today that are 10 years or over. So from the standpoint of the automotive wholesalers, I'm a little puzzled about their concern. Because in order for this legislation to have some of the concerns that they are talking about the automobile must first be 10 years old or older. And I would suggest that you have a right to look into your own experience to discuss that."

Matula: "Mr. Daniels, let's get away from the automobiles.

Let's get into some other products. Is this still holding true to the other products outside of automobiles? That's all we're talking about is automobiles. Let's get to washers or dryers or machinery or what have you...tractors."

Daniels: "Well, I think that maybe what you would wanna...in asking your question, discuss maybe something of...like heavy machinery, that has a useful life and represented to the purchaser of maybe 20 years and maybe is a piece of machinery that has punch press operation or something like that. Now, we've provided for that and we've made protections in that. Because what we've done there is we've said that the statute of repose if it's expressly warranted to the purchaser that the useful life of the machinery is longer than 10 years then the statute of repose will go along with the expressed warranty. In other words, if you express the warrant to the purchaser that you have a



20 year useful life, the statute of repose on that product will be 20 years. Once again, the same principle applies, if you introduce a newly designed replacement part into a machine that new design replacement part has a 10 year statute of repose....10 years to show that it is a safe and effective product, 10 years to protect the people that may possibly be injured by a defective newly designed replacement part. And that's what we're talking about.... protecting people and their rights as well as representing business throughout this state, not only the small businessman but the large businessman as a broad base."

Matula: "If I was a small businessman manufacturing a certain product or part...and I've got a million parts, now would that mean from this day on when this product liability Bill goes through I cannot utilize those parts anymore? Is that going to put me out of business?"

Daniels: "Not at all. That's a good question, Representative Matula, because under current law you have an unlimited liability on that replacement part. In other words, there's no statute of repose in current law today. So if you kept those million parts, you would have liability extending ad infinitum for as long as the life of those parts. Under current law today, if that's a newly designed product, effective January 1, 1979, and you introduced that newly designed replacement part into the original part, you're gonna have a 10 year Statute of repose on that newly designed replacement part and only be subject to liability under the theory of strict liability if you have introduced a new hazard in that replacement part that wasn't there before the part was replaced."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Matula, would you like to speak to the Bill now?"

Matula: "I have another question. May I ask him, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue. Make it the last one."

Matula: "Mr. Daniels, if I have been making these parts for a



number of years and I ran out and I'm gonna make some more in the same design, how does this Bill affect these parts now?"

Daniels: "Well, are you talking about replacement parts or original parts?"

Matula: "I've been making these replacement parts for years. All of a sudden I'm gonna make some more, now how will this affect these parts? Or will I go out of business?"

Daniels: "Are the replacement parts the same as the parts...."

Matula: "Yes, they're the same as the parts made previously."

Daniels: "Well, it would only start a statute of repose of 10 years if first of all that replacement part was of a new design. If you're holding that...today if you introduced that replacement part on the original product you have unlimited liability. You have unlimited liability for as long as you have that part in your possession or use it. Under the new law, you're in fact, given a break. What's the break. You're putting a limitation of 10 years on the exposure of possible liability. So, the new law would benefit you, Representative Matula."

Matula: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bennett, on Senate Bill 1847."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's kind of interesting to listen to the debate because I'm hearing my Republican colleagues attack a Bill that really many of our businessmen friends have been clamoring for for so long. I suppose in my particular district if there's any one top issue with the business people it's some kind of reform in products liability. Now, I'm a Member of the Trial Lawyers and in Committee I kind of went against that association when I went on record for House Bill 1333 and spoke my mind on that. Because I've been listening over and over and over again from the people in my district, particularly the small businessman, has been paying the high premiums....the high



premiums and not really having too much problem with products liability...but are saying, 'Allen, take care of us over there and when there is a chance to vote for some kind of reform, some kind, vote for it. Now, this is not the best Bill in the world for the businessman. No one is saying that it is. It is indeed a compromise as so many of our Bills are. But, certainly, colleagues on this side of the aisle....certainly, this is a step forward. And I say to you, don't listen to all those postcards that you're getting where they don't really say anything because they are preprinted and just fill in their names. This Bill is significant, it's a step forward and it should be supported."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber, on Senate Bill 1847."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Many of you have probably received a number of postcards from automobile parts dealers claiming that this Bill would be...do worse than do nothing. Well, they're wrong because in my opinion and I believe the opinion of most of the Members of the Subcommittee who heard testimony during the summer on the subject of the effect of the statute of repose....the statute of repose will basically do nothing as far as insurance premiums are concerned, either in a positive or negative sense. The fact of the matter is that all statistically meaningful accidents occur very shortly after the product is placed on the market and used for the first few times. As a matter of fact, after 72 months 99.9% of all injuries have occurred, which means you have 1/10th of 1% of injuries remaining to be occurred after 72 months which is of course much shorter than the statute of repose in this Bill. The fact of the matter is that a statute of repose of any sort because of the fact that the statistically meaningful injuries occur almost immediately is not going to help in relieving any one of any part of



their insurance premiums. The fact of the matter is that the insurance premiums are now stabilizing in Illinois as a result of current statistical data which is finally being maintained for the first time. So this Bill certainly is not going to hurt. The fears of those who are writing you are not justified. And because the business community which Representative Willer indicates...maybe a little bit confused, want this Bill and I suggest we ought to give it to them."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mautino on Senate Bill 1847."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a couple of questions...I have three?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He will."

Mautino: "On page 3, line 10, the definition of product includes any service provided in connection with the product. Where the term product unit is used it refers to a single item or unit of a product. Is that also concerning the distribution of a product? In other words, a trucking firm ...let's say in a case of Culligan equipment where they don't touch it they just deliver it to a place, is that included in that term?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels, to answer his inquiry."

Daniels: "This definition, as you have cited, includes and covers all people that are covered under the distribution. It covers the distributor."

Mautino: "Covers the distributor?"

Daniels: "Yeah."

Mautino: "O.K. Also on Page 4, line 15, delivery of possession of a product unit to its initial user, consumer or other nonseller shall be limited or barred by Subsection B which is the statute of repose. Right?"

Daniels: "Right."

Mautino: "That also includes the distributor?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Mautino: "I want this for the record, Danny."



Daniels: "O.K., fine."

Mautino: "Now, my last question is, that on page 6 of the Bill which is not a new portion being put in...on line 6, a defendant may bring in...he may bring in as a defendant a person, not a party to the action who is or may be liable to him for all or part of the plaintiff's claim against him.. Explain to me what that means."

Daniels: "That brings it more in line with the Skinner decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois."

Mautino: "Are you saying he indemnifies the third party?"

Daniels: "Right."

Mautino: "O.K. That's indemnification clause." O.K. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dan Houlihan, on Senate Bill 1847."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Senate Bill 1847. In my opinion there has been no more difficult and no more complicated issue that has faced this Legislative Body than the issue of productsliability. It is an extremely complex subject. It's a very complicated subject to deal with...certainly, I think the debate reflects that because there has been some confusion. Confusion I think that has been well addressed both by Representative Bennet and Representative Leinenweber. We have been considering the issue of productsliability here in this House for well over a year now. We held substantial hearings through the Product Liability Subcommittee of the Judiciary I Committee. And the Bill that is before us today is identical to House Bill 1333, which passed this Body with an overwhelming vote. And what Representative Daniels and I are suggesting to the Membership today...that that same vote should apply to Senate Bill 1847. It is indeed a legislative compromise. And while there is some concern from some parts that the Bill does not go as far as everyone would like it to go,



but there are competing interests here. What this represents is a commencement of a legislative response to the very complex issue of products liability. One thing was not mentioned as far as the substantive part of the Bill that in addition to the statute of repose, there are substantial reporting provisions incorporated in this Bill requiring the Department of Insurance to have data collection authority to get a better handle, as far as what the problem of insurance is that faces Illinois manufacturers and distributors. I think that this represents a solid legislative response to this complex issue. It is a compromise and I urge your support of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Rigney, on 1847."

Rigney: "Question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Rigney, continue."

Rigney: "I've got a 20 year old John Deere tractor. I put power steering on it. Does that constitute a new hazard?"

Daniels: "If it's the same design, no."

Rigney: "It had no power steering on it when I bought it.

I now put power steering on for the first time on a old tractor. Is that a new hazard?"

Daniels: "That would be a fact question for the jury, Representative Rigney. It could be presented to the jury and the jury would have to make that determination."

Rigney: "Well, you know, I've got some choices here. Maybe I go to my John Deere dealer to purchase that power steering but I could also put a M & W unit on or something like that to do the same job. Is there a difference between the two?"

Daniels: "Not in your set of circumstances because you've introduced the power steering into the John Deere tractor that wasn't there before. The question of whether or not that's a hazard would be a fact for the jury that the plaintiff would have to prove."



Rigney: "Well is there any difference between the standing of the John Deere unit because it's going on a John Deere tractor than if I put a M & W unit on it?"

Daniels: "None whatsoever under your set of....under your example. None."

Rigney: "O.K. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Flinn. Representative Monroe Flinn. Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. And the question being the main question to be put. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Daniels, to close."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the dialogue and discussion on this Bill has been excellent. I think that what we've presented to you is in the true spirit of legislative compromise. As one of the principal Sponsors of this legislation with Representative Houlihan....we are not saying that this particular Bill composing the statute of repose and insurance gathering information is an answer to the problems of products liability. What we are saying to you it is in fact a meaningful first step towards product liability reform. We intend to file a new piece of legislation in the 81st General Assembly to additionally address the items of this products liability reform that are necessary. As a matter of fact, as recent as one hour ago we met in the Speaker's office with some of the people that were opposed to this legislation and assured them that if this Bill passes and becomes law, we will treat their requests with great concern and include that in the next piece of legislation that hopefully will be addressed with meaning in the 81st General Assembly. I will hold to that request and I can tell you that those of you that those of you who are returning, we will be discussing



productsliability reform in further detail during the 81st General Assembly. I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1847 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative McMaster, to explain his vote for one minute."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry I was off the floor of the House when a great deal of this debate went on. But I am concerned about one thing. I have a number of auto partsdealers who have written me in regard to this Bill. It seems that they cannot replace the part on an automobile that is not made by that automobile corporation...in the beginning. Now, whether that has been changed, Lee, I don't know. But you could find many cases where there is a better replacement part than the original factory prepared part. And let me point out why. We have had any number of cases in the news for the past three or four years of any or all of the automobile corporations that have had to recall automobiles because of defective parts. And again, you are saying in this Bill that you must use original parts from the corporation that produces them. And I think....if this is still in the Bill, it's a very, very, very, bad Bill."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I admire the way lawyers compromise. The industry needed a loaf of bread and they got a crumb off the end of the loaf. Now any of you who think that this is going to lower the cost of productsliability insurance is just kidding themselves. And you've heard the testimony here that it's not going to do anything for them at all. It's a token. The only hope I find is....we don't have any choice, we have to vote for it because it's a step and the promise of Representative Daniels and others that we're going to take another step



or two next year. But I can tell you right now this does literally nothing for the products liability problem in the State of Illinois. But you have no other choice. This at least indicates that we have an interest and I am ashamed of what little interest we have."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McPike, to explain his vote."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hesitate to explain a vote when it's passing overwhelmingly but I think one thing should be mentioned. We've done a lot of.....we've had a lot of discussion on automotive industry where defects generally show up in the first year or two along with most other products but there are quite a few other industries where the defects do not show up for many, many years. One of those, of course, is the aircraft industry. I think you should know that if a wing comes off a 747 in 10 years and 1 day after it has been manufactured that.....that under this Bill the manufacturer will not be held liable under strict.....under the doctrine of strict liability for that accident. I think that the aircraft industry and many others are in this same situation where the defect does not show up for many, many years and the manufacturer could and should be held liable for all action. This is a.....it is a compromise and I think it's a poor compromise. And for that reason, I am voting 'no'."

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

Kelly: "Well, I'll just explain one thing and maybe I..... possibly, I hope I'll be doing the right thing. But, last year we voted for legislation on workman's comp to make corrections. And I supported that legislation feeling that I was helping all of the business communities and I found out contrary....that I....in fact it was hurting the industry. And I would like to vote for this legislation but I...in the past received wrong types of information



on this same subject from the business community....and I will vote against it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schuneman, to explain his vote."

Schuneman: "Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker. One of the problems in products liability field has been that the courts in making their decisions over the last few years have taken some drastic departures from previous legal positions. And the insurance industry has been scared to death to write products liability insurance. The Illinois Legislature has not indicated any willingness to make changes of this kind in the past. And consequently, insurance companies have not been willing to take on some of these products liability risks except at a very, very high premium. Now I suggest to you that one of the things we're doing here today is sending a signal to the insurance industry that the Illinois Legislature at least has an interest in this problem. And we are taking one step.... one very small step in the direction that I think we need to go and from that standpoint I think we may be doing some good here today. And I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. I didn't recognize a couple of the Members because they spoke in debate. On this question there are 133 'ayes', 26 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, on Senate Bill....excuse me, just a moment. Representative Dave Jones would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Dave Jones, 'aye' on that last Roll Call. Representative Byers, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion on the calendar relating to....."

Speaker Giorgi: "We're not ready for that. We're taking Roll Calls now and we're going to Senate Bill 309 at this point,



Mr. Byers. Representative.....Mr. Clark, read the Senate Bill. Is that 393? 395. Read Senate Bill 395. Excuse me one moment, Mr. Wolf, is this on Senate Bill 395?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently forgot to vote on the last Bill. I would ask unanimous consent....'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave to vote? No objections. J.J. Wolf, 'aye' on the last Roll Call. Birchler 'aye' on the last Roll Call....and also Peggy Smith Martin 'aye' on the last Roll Call. That's Birchler, Martin and Wolf. Clerk, Senate Bill 395."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 395 was taken back to Second Reading and held. Amendment #3 was offered by Representative Hoffman. Amends Senate Bill 395 on page 1, line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hoffman, on Senate Bill 395."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Previously I had moved this Bill back to Second and tabled Amendment #2. But at that time Amendment #3 was not distributed. Amendment #3 is now distributed and it does the same as Amendment #2....provides that the purchase of care...Rate Review Board staff will have the authority to....under the rules and regulations of the board to set rates for purchase of care under this program. And also it changes the language to identify that a school district is responsible for the tuition cost of any student that is a resident of that school district as opposed to residing there. And I would move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Houlihan, on the Amendment. Representative Dan Houlihan, on the Amendment."

Houlihan: "Could you go through that last sentence that you were referring to....the obligation of the school district."

Hoffman: "Sure. You remember....or you may remember that we had an issue in terms of who was responsible for the



tuition costs for private placement....whether it was the school district that was sending the kid or whether it was the child...or whether it was the school district where the home was located. This clarifies that issue and I believe it was Judge Dunn who ruled in terms it was the school district of which the child was a resident. And that is....that's what's in that part of it."

Houlihan: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "If there be no further discussion....the question is on the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 395. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. On the calendar on page 2 appears House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 2632. 2632. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, is this on House Bill.....Representative Adams, for what reason do you rise? On this House Bill 2632? Just a moment. Mr. Adams."

Adams: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Adams: "I see some people bearing gifts in the House today and I see a dozen roses going up to Penny Pullen's desk and I would like to ask if they came from Mr. Levin since they are getting together on some issues. Oh, I understand they came from Representative Marovitz, excuse me."

Speaker Giorgi: "Let the record show. House Bill 2632. Representative Davis for....on House Bill 2632?"

Davis: "No, Mr. Speaker, another point of personal privilege along the same line. On a concurrence order this morning.... Representative Pullen had a concurrence motion that Representative Marovitz did not vote for. So we assume that the alliance that was formed yesterday that was so solid broke down overnight and we would like to know the reason why."

Speaker Giorgi: "You can tell we are getting near the end of Session. Representative Robinson, on House Bill 26....."



just a moment. Representative Robinson, for a moment."

Robinson: "On the same issue, Representative Pullen and I have Amendment #85 to House Bill 3069 and Representative Pullen asked that we have leave to add Representative Marovitz to our Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "We are not on that order of business but we'll recognize Representative Marovitz for a moment. Representative Marovitz, for a moment."

Marovitz: "Just a point of clarification of personal privilege. The breakdown occurred because of performance. I'm speaking about performance on the House floor and I think....I certainly object to the minds of the colleagues. I wanted to make that clear."

Speaker Giorgi: "Let's get back to business. House Bill 2632, Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2632. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,18,19,20 and 22 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any motions as to the Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #20 to House Bill 2632 by Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Marovitz, on the motion to table Amendment #20 to House Bill 2632. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Motion to table Amendment #20.... because the Amendment reduces the appropriation to Bilingual Education from 13 million 45 down below the fiscal 1978 level. The Committee had reduced the Bilingual Appropriation in its wisdom down to the fiscal 1978 level which was 10 million 350 thousand dollars. Amendment #20 further reduces it even below 1978 levels to 9 million, 418 thousand, 5 hundred. I am moving to table Amendment #20



which is a further reduction below even last year's funding level. The bilingual programs have already been set up, plans and contracts have been let and determined for the program. The reduction of Amendment #20 even below 1978 levels would make it virtually impossible for any of those programs to exist and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on the motion to table Amendment #20."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kosinski, on the motion to table."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in reference to my good friend, Representative Marovitz's motion to table, I object to this motion. I was the Sponsor of this Amendment and let me tell you.....may I talk to the Amendment also, Sir?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Repeat that, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "May I talk to the Amendment also as to why I object?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes."

Kosinski: "The Amendment essentially said this; this Amendment reduces by 4 million, 36 thousand, 5 hundred dollars from the FY 79 GR effort....General Revenue Fund for the Chicago Bilingual Education Program as a means....here's the key....as a means of limiting the program to an intermediary rather than a permanent service to bilingual students. In the original acceptance of the Bilingual Program....as a staunch supporter, but I wish to....this to be a bridge, only a bridge between Spanish and English and other bilingual subjects. I don't wish it to become a full-time program and I am afraid that's what it is doing. The children are not getting back into the mainstream as quickly as they can. And it's on that premise that I offered this Amendment. I object to the table....the motion to table."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me for a moment. Mr. Bowman, for what reason do you rise?"

Bowman: "Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. It seems



to me that the Amendment itself, although adopted in Committee, is out of order because it puts substantive language into the Appropriation Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "No, I don't think that's the case in this case, Mr. Bowman. Mr. McClain, on the motion to table."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of the motion to table Amendment #20 to House Bill 2632. Mr. Kosinski feels very strongly about this Amendment and he and I have talked often. Although, I should point out to the Membership that indeed this cut across party lines and it is not a Bakalis Amendment or a Thompson Amendment, it's something that some people feel very strongly about. I, too, feel very strongly about it. I don't think you can necessarily say that the bridge for bilingual education ought to be only two years. Some people will need three, some people only need six weeks. I don't think necessarily that you can arbitrarily have this cut off. The Latinos and the Puerto Ricans in the Chicago area and other areas in the State of Illinois feel very strongly about that. And I think people especially that represent those areas ought to be very, very concerned with this kind of Amendment. I...with all respect to the Sponsor of the Amendment, I strongly support Mr. Marovitz and his motion to table this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jack Davis, on the motion."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As most of you will recall, Representative Conti and I led the charge last year to significantly reduce this line item. Over the hiatus and the....the summer last year and in subsequent meetings we've had many conversations with the bilingual people and managed to reach an agreement with them that we would support for this year's funding a level at the 1978 expenditure level. Now what....I have all great respect for Representative



Kosinski and for what he is attempting to do because I attempted to do the same thing last year. However, I have concluded and I'm willing to go along and support Representative Marovitz's motion to table here simply because Amendment 21 which was not told to you or not mentioned to you added in 130 thousand in the Categorical Grant Budget for an independent third party study of bilingual in Illinois to take place some time prior to the appropriation process next year. And hopefully that will resolve the question once and for all of whether bilingual in Illinois is a cruel hoax on those who participate in it, is a wastrel in terms of the state's money or is indeed a fine program and what implementation of that program is best whether it is six weeks, 2 years, 1 year or 5 years. So I strongly support Representative Marovitz's motion, again, with all due respect to Representative Kosinski, who's a close friend of mine."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz, on the motion."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to inquire....I understand this is a Committee Amendment. But it's not in the Bill book and I'd like to see a copy of the Amendment. Was it distributed?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Leverenz, I've been notified by the Head Bill Clerk that Amendment #20 and 22 did not come back from the printer but they were adopted in Committee."

Leverenz: "I'll check with the printer."

Speaker Giorgi: "On this point, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Does that mean that you're gonna move this Bill to Third Reading immediately like you did Senate Bill 1680?"

Speaker Giorgi: "It is....inasmuch as this Bill was.....this Amendment was put on in Committee and there are 25 Members of the Committee, I'm sure that that was done orderly. This motion's put orderly. So we are going to continue in that vein for the next few moments anyway. Representative



Skinner."

Skinner: "Why are you not being consistent? My motion was printed on the desks and you wouldn't allow it to be considered."

Speaker Giorgi: "I'm being very consistent. The Amendment has been adopted in Committee."

Skinner: "Consistently inconsistent."

Speaker Giorgi: "Maybe consistently inconsistent, but I'm consistent. Representative Schneider, on this point."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you advise if the succeeding Amendments would be in order then if this is ...if the other two are not available to us...even though they were adopted in Committee?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The Clerk will read Amendment #20."

Schneider: "And then what?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #20, amends House Bill 2632 on page 19, line 26, by deleting 13 million, 455 thousand dollars and inserting in lieu thereof 9 million, 418 thousand and 500 dollars."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti, on the Amendment...on the motion. Representative Hoffman, on the motion."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me bring to your attention that we're looking now at House Bill 2632 which is the categorical Bill for the distribution of funds to schools. And that every dollar that we put into programs that are mandated, are dollars that we're going to have to take out of the general distributive formula. The Bilingual Program is not a mandated program in terms of funding levels. The level for the nonmandated programs ought to be fairly close or at the present level because every dollar that we put in the categoricals that are nonmandated, this is money that has to come out of the general distributive fund which goes to all of your schools on a equalized per capita basis. It's for that reason that I rise to oppose the



Amendment to table...or the motion to table Amendment #20. This Amendment reduces the bilingual appropriation by 931 thousand and 5 hundred dollars. That still doesn't bring it down to the level that it should be. There's no reason why we can't evaluate...there's no reason why we can't evaluate the bilingual program funded at the current level as well as we can funded at some fatter level. And it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in opposition to this motion. We ought to take every dime out of this categorical that's not required for fully funding our programs, our mandated programs as we can so that we can get that money to the schools on the basis of the pupils they have rather than on the basis of some special category."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan, on the Amendment. Oh, he's not on the floor. Representative Brady, on the Amendment."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that we're talking about the motion regarding the Amendment. I would just like to address myself to some of the comments made by the last Speaker. Number one, when he says it's not a mandated program, that is not necessarily true. There is a mandate where you have 20 or more children that fit into this category, this service in bilingual education has to be provided. The federal government mandates that it has to be provided. There is an entire package of Bills that he is persuing, special education Bills that come through with a mandate of the federal government and put us in compliance so that we can receive funds and can continue to teach the children in this category. There is no question about the mandate of this. And if we reduce the levels down below last year's level, we're going to find school districts coming up with the money out of their own pockets to fund this rather than the consistent approach we've used in the past with so much for downstate



schools and so much for Chicago schools. I don't think in deference to Representative Kosinski's position that I can agree with the fact that he says it can be a two year and a phase-out program. I would have to suggest I think it has to be longer than that in some circumstances. I respectfully disagree with his opinion on this and I would urge you to support the motion to table this Amendment so that we could have bilingual education funding at the proper level I think we need it for this year in the school Bill. One further thing is, this does not tie to the general distributive formula. Representative Hoffman states that if we spend a dollar here it comes out of the General School Revenue Fund. That's not correct. It comes out of the Revenue Fund for the State of Illinois. But we're the ones who decide on the budget here. We're the ones who decide that categorical grants may be just as important as distributive fund grants and they may have to come out of some other funding mechanism that somebody else disagrees with. But it does not suggest that because we spend a dollar here it has to come out of the distributive formula. It may have to come out of a road somewhere. So I would urge the motion....to agree with the motion to table this Amendment and put the funding at the level it should be at."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Byers, on the motion."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Kosinski is not taking all the money out in this appropriation. He is simply reducing it and trying to limit the program rather than let it grow each year as it has been growing. I think some of you may not be aware that there's a report out by HEW that questions the value of bilingual education and....at all. And I think that Representative Kosinski has offered a very reasoned and a very thought out Amendment that should be supported. He's leaving money in for the program. He's simply reducing it to last year's level



so that the program cannot expand. We're spending money in the Illinois State Scholarship...even to train teachers, we're spending 200 thousand dollars there. And if we don't get a hold of this and vote 'no' we're going to be spending more and more and more. And in fact, many of the kids that go back to Puerto Rico, in fact, can't even speak the native language because they don't teach it right here in our country. So I would recommend support of Representative Kosinski and vote 'no' on this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Telcser, on the motion."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support Representative Marovitz's motion. And I think it's interesting that we've come to this point. You may recall that there were two Members on my side of the aisle showed a great deal of concern about the bilingual program which we've had in the State of Illinois. And they took the trouble and the time out of their busy schedules to spend this entire year to look at the question of bilingual education. Representative Jack Davis is one of those Members who took that time to look into the question. It seems to me that if someone like himself, has taken a position to have an open mind and wait for the valuation study to take place, we ought to support Representative Marovitz and Representative Davis' position. Here we have two Members from both sides of the issue who have worked hard, who have taken time to agree upon a figure which each of the two sides could live with. That is those who are strong proponents for bilingual education and those who still consider it a question in their mind. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, of course I have always supported bilingual education. But nevertheless, I think that the fact that interested Legislators have come to a reconciliation, so to speak, for this year's budget adds credibility to Representative Marovitz's motion. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it



is for those reasons that I rise to support Representative Marovitz's motion to table Amendment....the Amendment to House Bill 2632."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan, on the motion."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the regular Bill, the Operation In Grant Bill, for the Office of Education which I and Representative Brady are chief Sponsors. I'd like to point out that while the Gentleman is offering this Amendment, Amendment #20 and it was adopted in Committee, that there hasn't been much thought given to the fact that not only is this a mandated program but in the City of Chicago they're under a federal court order to expand it. Now if you want to talk about mandates, you not only have a federal mandate to provide the bilingual education but on top of that have had a federal court judge mandate, on top of the law, the fact that you must expand the bilingual education in that city. Now for this Amendment to be adopted on the Bill will completely fly in the face of the court order and the federal mandate which in turn jeopardizes our sharing in federal funds on education. And I can't emphasize strongly enough that people sometimes use that word mandated for their own purposes. This is a mandated program, not only federally but by under state statute. We have an obligation to meet that law that we, the Members of the General Assembly, have adopted and passed into law. And certainly all of us should recognize that that is a myth to say that because we expend our money on bilingual education those dollars we do not expend there will automatically go to the formula funding. That's an error. That's a myth. It's a phony argument. We should be fully funding and we should be fully funding our mandated programs along with that question of fully funding all of education. I support the motion to table."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti, on the motion."



Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all let me clarify, I am for Jack Davis' motion and I'm also against the tabling of this. We tried to send them a message last year...and I do want to correct the last speaker that just spoke. It is a mandated program. But when the program first started it was mandated for 2 million dollars. Secretary Califano, of HEW, has issued a strong statement opposed to this. This program has gone up 700%. Now the appropriation that you find in this Bill is for 13 million dollars. But there were three other Bills that were presented in this House this year, one included 300 thousand dollars to teach teachers how to speak Spanish so that they can speak bilingual languages. So it's not only the 13 million dollars that's in this program, there are at least 4 other Bills in this House that have included it. Now I was one of the four or five Members that...the colleague on this side of the aisle talked about meeting with these people and I expressed some concern...about five of them. Children in bilingual programs are not being taught English. I was concerned that teachers in bilingual programs are foreigners who do not speak the English language. The cost of bilingual programs continue to increase, 700% since it's inception. The cultural dimensions of bilingual program is not needed, it encourages separation of culture and maintenance. Now the mandated program is to teach them English and get them back into the mainstream. They were not able to tell me one...or how much or what percentage of the students are getting back into the mainstream so that when they do get out of school they can find a suitable job that they don't have to go on public welfare or public aid. Now they've even gone a little further. Now they are not only teaching them the bilingual language but they also want to teach them their own culture that they didn't get from their parents. This program is going to amount as much as



the common school fund had since 1943 and I tell you as of today, ten years from now if we allow this to go on without sending them a strong message, we're going to have a 100 million dollar bilingual program in the State of Illinois. I want to send a strong message to them. I support Kosinski's Amendment. I support Jack Davis in making his complete investigation. But how long are we going to wait to keep sending them a message. You and I have cut many a good programs off of our own educational programs in the State of Illinois. And, still in all, we're going out and spending 13 million dollars for a bilingual program that the Secretary of HEW says is bad and everybody is condemning. The mandated program was for 2 million and not for 13 million. I urge the support of Kosinski's Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stuffle, on the motion. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of Representative Kosinski and rise in opposition to the motion to table. If you were here last year, you saw Representative Conti offer an Amendment that was supported easily by a majority of people on this floor on Second Reading, that cut bilingual education considerably. Not until the 11th hour, at about 4 o'clock in the morning, was that money put back in a Conference Committee when many of the people who opposed it didn't know what was in that report. They did not support funding bilingual education at the level that is was funded last year. And they would not support funding it at a level of those who would table this Amendment this year. Representative Conti is absolutely right. We're putting program upon program for everyone but the average student. I have nothing against those in bilingual programs, special ed programs or other programs, but we're taking money out of the mainstream of education. We're doing it in the name of federal mandates. Representative



Kosinski's Amendment is fair. It is proper. It's an honest approach to a problem. It neither goes too far or too fast and we ought to reject the motion to table it and support Representative Kosinski. Vote 'no' on the motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Katz on the motion."

Katz: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Turn on Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yes, I rise in opposition to the motion to table. As I have observed it, it appears to me that the bilingual program is working to the disadvantage, not only of the country but more specifically of the young people in the schools. It is a simple fact that the way you learn the English language is to communicate in the English language. And that as long as you provide extensive opportunities for speaking in another tongue, the young person will simply not acquire the facility in the English language. For that reason, it seems to me, that the bilingual program has worked contrary to the intentions of those who support it and I support the Amendment that has been offered."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gene Barnes, on the motion."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to make something clear. I'm not speaking pro or con on the motion. But there was a statement made that in this Bill there are 13 million dollars for bilingual education. That is not correct. The correct amount, Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Give the Gentleman some order. He wants to explain what happened in the Appropriations Committee."

Barnes: "There was a statement made that there was 13 million dollars in this Bill for bilingual education. This Bill came in with a 13 million, 400 thousand...plus, request for bilingual. The Appropriations Committee Staff Amendment reduced that by 3 million, 115 thousand. So the level of funding in this Bill...the level of funding



in this Bill is 10 million, 350 thousand, not 13 million."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves that the previous question be put. The question being, shall the main question be put? All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. And Representative Marovitz to close on his motion to table Amendment #20."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to reiterate that the appropriation was put in at 13 million and the Committee itself cut the appropriation back to fiscal 78 levels at 10 million. This cuts it further below fiscal 78 levels...would make it impossible for bilingual programs to be properly carried out. The Appropriation Committee in it's wisdom, appropriated 130 thousand dollars for the study of bilingual programs and their effectiveness. If that study is going to be effective, let's find out the background, the rationale and whats going on before we make these cuts so that the programs can't work. Many Legislators in this House expressed certain concerns about bilingual education. Because of those concerns, I arranged a meeting so that people would come down from the City of Chicago, provide statistics and meet with those Legislators about their questions. Representative Conti was one of those Legislators...Representative Davis was another. Senator Grotberg was another one that was invited. I have statistics right here that have been provided as to the question of mainstreaming and to the summary of district by district data relative to students transition from bilingual back to all English programs. And, anybody that wants these statistics, I'll make them available to you. I've given them to Representative Davis as well as to Representative Conti. One of the previous speakers said we should cut every dime. If you want to cut every dime from these programs, then you might



as well tell every Hispanic child in the State of Illinois we're not interested in their education. Let them go back where they came from, we don't care. We've got mandated programs in this state and it's also federally mandated. If you're gonna mandate a program...we've heard complaints around this state, we mandate programs, we provide no funding. These programs are mandated, let's provide the funding levels. This funding is not increased, it's only at fiscal 78 levels. If we want these children to be productive citizens in the future, let's give them the opportunity. We've also provided for the study. We're not asking for too much money. We're asking for the same levels as last year. And I would ask for an affirmative vote on this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is on the motion to table Committee Amendment #20 to House Bill 2632. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me make it very clear that the funding level for the bilingual program is not mandated. It's not comparable to special ed. It's not comparable to transportation. It's a different ball game and I don't want anybody to confuse that. Secondly, it is not....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me. You spoke in debate and that precludes you from explaining your vote."

Hoffman: My name was mentioned in debate, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "By who?"

Hoffman: "By Representative.....from Cook County....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, get up on a point of personal privilege then." Leave him up on a point of personal privilege."

Hoffman: "Thank you, but....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Hoffman,"

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to thank the Representative for mentioning my name. What I



say that money that is spent in categorical is not going to be available for the general distributive fund, you know and I know, that in fact, that is the case."

Speaker Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Hoffman. Does he persist in this point of order? I think...."

Hoffman: "I've made my point."

Speaker Giorgi: "O.K. Representative Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose this measure....this motion to table Representative Kosinski's Amendment. I had visits during the last several months from teachers who are teaching in the bilingual program who said that this program has to be investigated or it has to be stopped. Because it's a bag of worms and there was a lot of trouble in this area. I feel that Representative Kosinski's Amendment will help to carry this message forward and make corrections which are necessary. And that's why I'm voting 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Whether the program is mandated or not we've faced federal mandates before. We did it with motorcycle helmets and we told them to go to blazes and the federal government relinquished. Bilingual education has not worked. There are many students who have come to this country speaking only one language and that was not English and it has taken them a little over a year to learn the English language and they should continue in that way. Let me remind you, there is one great city in this hemisphere which has bilingual education and which nows has a bilingual community....and that's Quebec. And now they are facing rebellion and succession because of that bilingualism in that city. And I don't think we need it in this country."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, English is the language of this land. And if you want to look at that scoreboard up there, look at some of those names....Marovitz, Lechowicz, etc. on and on. Three fourths of those names have people with a.... European heritage where they spoke a different language. When they came here, just because we didn't have a bilingual language, they didn't get the message they were supposed to go home, they got the message they were supposed to learn English....the language of the land. And I think that we are making a mistake in trying to keep this a bilingual nation."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jack Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "No, Sir, not to explain my vote, I spoke in debate, to rise on a point of personal privilege. My name was mentioned in debate by Representative....who made the motion. I would just like to make the point clear that lest I appear to be too terribly inconsistent, I am still an opponent of bilingual education for the same reasons I stated last year. And those reasons are very simple. I still consider the fact that all the points that were made by the previous speaker and Representative Conti and others...still appeal to me in the idea that bilingual education as I perceive it today in the State of Illinois is a cruel form of segregation. But I want to confirm that and Amendment #22, not 21, to this same Bill adds in money for a third party independent study of the program and for the corrections of the program. And we can come back here next year and do whatever we will with that program...But at least we will finally have some really solid basis for our fears, our unknown and for the realities to the situation. So, lest I appear inconsistent, I am willing to go along with them this year and wait for the results of that study next year. And if results are anywhere near what I think they will be or



suspect that they might be, then we can cut next year.
And we can cut drastically or we can maintain level."

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

Skinner: "In my first year of school I went to school with displaced persons. And they learned English and even though they were all older than I was, they didn't stay in the class that long. I would suggest that we don't need to spend 10 million dollars educating illegal aliens in the State of Illinois. That's primarily what this Bill does. We didn't mandate bilingual education. If you say the federal courts did, fine, let the federal courts find the money. Let them try to...by court order, force the Illinois General Assembly to appropriate the money. Why don't we end this hoax on the taxpayers and the Spanish speaking people right now. Why wait another year and put another PhD on the payroll?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Antonovych, to explain his vote."

Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I may qualify as a limited expert on this English language since I was six years old when I arrived to this country. I spent the first two years sitting in the last row in an all English speaking school. So I did not have the benefit of a bilingual education program. However, I feel very strongly that it is needed. The circumstances are different than were described for the coming of the East Europeans to this country. When you have Puerto Ricans and Mexicans whose countries are very accessible and yes, families still living in Puerto Rico or Mexico with a peculiar migration situation where people spend quite a bit of their time....for example, when you have high school kids...you talk to them, you will see that they have spent half of their 18 years in Puerto Rico or in Mexico. If we do not give them an opportunity to learn our language, how



do we expect to instill the values of our society so that they would accept them? On the other hand, we have to worry about appropriating more funds for correctional programs and worry about them when they become outcasts of society. So....I'm a strong believer in education and you cannot have a very good educational system if you don't get to the first base, and that is the language. So, I would ask you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, chaotic though this chamber oft is, except when you grace the Chair, the thought occurs to me it would be pure bedlam if we ever had that unhappy day when we had a bilingual system. Can you imagine how intolerable that would be? You would want to conduct it in Italian and some in French and all. And I think that we need to recognize that that would be a real possibility unless we stop this madness. The only difficulty is that the slice in the expenditures this year is entirely too low. Hopefully next year, you'll do your duty and cut it all out. But you need to be a little attentive. Last year after a bitter battle and a small reduction it went to the Governor's desk and there was actually an addition to the amount of money being spent on the bilingual program. We need to be more vigilant on behalf of English. It is the language that we all speak and it binds us together. Be proud to vote 'no' on this one."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Marovitz, to explain his vote."

Marovitz: "In support of some of the things we were saying about the children being mainstreamed. Just to name a few districts, in Joliet the total number of students enrolled in fiscal 78 was 460, in fiscal 79 that will go down.... 102 students will go back into the all English speaking classes. The....in Elgin, 223 in fiscal 78. Sixty-three out of that 223 in that one year alone, go back into



all English speaking classes. In other Elgin school districts, 50% of those districts...of those students after one year to into all English speaking classes. In East Aurora, 160 students after one year went back into all English speaking classes. This is just a....in support of the fact that the program is working and if there's problems with the program, the money that has been appropriated by the Committee for a study of bilingual education in all its phases, let's not cut off the funding before we get the results of the study. If there's a problem, fine, let's rectify the problems that the Committee finds as a result of its study. Let's not cut off the funding first. These kids need an education if they want to be good citizens of our country. They come here, they can't speak English, we want to help them progress and learn at the same time. Let's give these kids a chance. Things are different. Things work out. Let's give these kids a chance. We want to keep the funding level at fiscal 78 level from 13 to 10 million dollars. I would ask for a few more 'aye' votes. And, Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask for a verification at the appropriate time."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative James Houlihan, to explain his vote. James Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there has been a great deal of controversy over funding of special programs and grants as opposed to funding of the formula. In fact, I know that there are Amendments to follow which delete all of these special grant categories. And that there has been quite an issue related to some of grant programs because some Members have suggested that those grant programs go to the more wealthy districts and the districts that can afford to run programs and they get partially reimbursed. I would suggest to you that this is an area that is critical, that it's not an area which sends money to the more wealthy districts and that it is



an area that ought to be funded. It ought to be maintained because if these people are not...being given the opportunity to be in the mainstream of America, not be able to be productive citizens by jobs and by vocation, what we will end up is having a more costly price tag on it and it will be a disaster to the State of Illinois. I think we have to make this commitment and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative W.D. Walsh, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative Marovitz, do you request a verification of a Negative Roll Call? Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I ask for a poll of the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Waddell on this point? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "May I be verified as 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Can Mr. Marovitz...Waddell would like to be verified as 'no'. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Harris, Hart, Emil Jones, Kornowicz, Madison, McGrew, Peters, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just verify the negative because that was the prevailing side. The negative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Anderson, Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Bennett, Bianco, Bluthardt, Boucek, Bradley, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Campbell, Capparelli, Christensen, Collins, Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Deavers, Deuster, John Dunn, Ebbesen, Edgar, Ewing, Flinn...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me. My colleague, Representative Hanahan, requests that Members please be in their seats so they can identify the Negative Roll Call. Continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Hudson, Huskey, Dave Jones, Kane, Katz, Keats, Kelly, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kucharski, Leinenweber, Luft, Macdonald, Mahar, Matula, Mautino, McAuliffe, McCourt..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Reilly,



for what purpose do you rise?"

Reilly: "Could I be verified, please, I have to leave?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Marovitz, does he have leave to be verified?"

Leave has been granted. Reilly is verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "McMaster...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Boucek, for what reason do you rise?"

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be verified?"

No objection, leave is granted. Boucek is verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Miller, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Neff, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Rigney, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sharp, Simms, Skinner, Stanley, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Sumner, Terzich, Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, Vinson, VonBoeckman, Waddell, R.V. Walsh, W.D. Walsh, Wikoff, Willer, Williams and Wolf."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Marovitz, do you have any questions of the Negative Roll Call?"

Marovitz: "Yes, I do. Representative Bennett."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bennett. Is Representative Bennett in the chambers? Representative Bennett is in his seat."

Marovitz: "Representative Boucek."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Boucek was verified."

Marovitz: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stuffle. Representative Stuffle is in the back of the room."

Marovitz: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Giorgi: "Capparelli is in the well here."

Marovitz: "Terzich. He can't be too far away."

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

Marovitz: "Representative Edgar."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Edgar. He's in his seat."



Marovitz: "Ebbesen."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen. How's he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Ebbesen in the chambers? Take him off the record."

Marovitz: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Christensen is in...."

Marovitz: "I'm sorry, I see him. Representative Friedland."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich is in his seat."

Marovitz: "Friedland."

Speaker Giorgi: "Friedland. Representative Friedland is standing in the back of the room."

Marovitz: "Representative Keats."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keats. Representative Keats is in the back of the room."

Marovitz: "Representative Molloy."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Molloy is in his seat. Excuse me, Mr. Marovitz. Representative Caldwell, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "How is Representative Caldwell recorded?"

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

Caldwell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote Representative Caldwell from 'present' to 'aye'."

Marovitz: "Representative Schlickman. I'm sorry....I'm sorry I see him. Representative Wikoff."

Speaker Giorgi: "He is in his seat."

Marovitz: "I'm going to withdraw, no further questions."

Speaker Giorgi: "No further questions. Representative Madison, for what reason do you rise? He wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Madison wants to be recorded as voting 'aye' from....not voting. And that doesn't change the count. Representative Steczo wants to be



recorded as voting 'no'. Steczo, 'no'. Representative Terzich wants to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. The count now is 78 'ayes', 88 'noes' and this motion fails. Representative Jones, for what reason do you rise? This motion to table fails. Are there any other motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #11 to House Bill 2632 by Representative Anderson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson is recognized on the motion to table Amendment #11 to House Bill 2632.... Committee Amendment. Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, what Amendment #11 does, it reduces the line item for textbooks by 4 million dollars. Now, the state board in their proposed budget studied the problem and they have....rec....recommended 9 million dollars. And in Committee this was reduced down to 5, that was the appropriation for the 78 fiscal year. I think this is one place where we can help all the children of the State of Illinois. They all profit by this text book plan and I recommend that we table Amendment #11."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan, on the motion to table Amendment #11."

Hanahan: "Well Mr. Speaker, I'm in support of the Gentleman's motion and I am chief Sponsor of the Bill. But I would like to point out to the Gentleman and to the Members of the House that there is Amendment #28 that if we adopt Amendment #11....adopt the motion to table, Amendment #28 would be technically incorrect and would probably be ruled out of order. So I'm suggesting that if we're for Amendment #28, which is Janes Barnes' and Brady's Amendment, my Cosponsor in this legislation...or is it going to be correct?oh, I'm sorry. I'm for Representative Anderson's motion. I support it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson to close on.....Representative Hoffman, on the motion. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of



the House, the Amendment which was adopted in Committee reduced the level of funding for this program to last year's level. That money this year had been distributed all across the grade levels to the eighth grade...in the public school program. This is sufficient money for this category in my judgment. Again, this is taking money from the General Distributive Fund and that we should not support this motion. I think this was a wise decision on the part of the Committee and the position should be maintained here on the floor of the House."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Byers, on the motion."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would rise to support this motion. It saves 4 million dollars that can be used in the other Bills....to fund education to pay for mandated programs. And I would support this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson, to close."

Anderson: "Yes, this is one program that I really have a lot of thanks for because it helps all the children of the State of Illinois....public, private schools, both. The program is well needed with it's....you know, rising costs and I would certainly appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #11 to House Bill 2632. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The motion is to table Amendment #11. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 81 'ayes', 36 'nays' and 4 voting 'present' and this motion prevails. Any further motions to Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further motions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson, for what reason do you rise?"

Anderson: "I'd like to question the germaneness of Amendment #10."

Speaker Giorgi: "It's too late, the Amendment has been adopted quite some time ago"



Representative Collins, for what reason do you rise?
You wanna vote 'yes'? Representative Madison, for what
reason do you rise on this...Representative Madison.?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative Barnes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Barnes, Representative Madison
yields to you. Representative Gene Barnes."

Barnes: " "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I would ask...
request the Speaker, if he could, get the Parliamentarian.
This request was made in Committee and I indicated to
Representative Anderson that I was not equipped at that
time to make a ruling and that I would ask that the
Parliamentarian would make a ruling on this particular Amendment
when it came up on Second Reading. So, I would ask the
Speaker, if he could get the Parliamentarian to take a
look at Amendment #10 and rule thereon."

Speaker Giorgi: "In the meantime, continue on with other
motions. Mr. Barnes, while we're working on your rul...
question, we'll move on with the business of the House.
Any further motions to Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further motions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #23, Kane, amends House Bill
2632 as amended in Section 2.03 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane, on Amendment #23."

Kane: "I would withdraw Amendment #23."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment
#23. Any objections? Leave is granted. Amendment #23
is withdrawn."



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #24, Kane. Amends House Bill 2632, as amended, in Section 3...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane on Amendment 24."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #24

....the need for Amendment #24 I think has been demonstrated very well in the last 45 minutes that we've gone through on this...on this floor of the House. There are 21 categorical grant programs in House Bill 2632. The total number of dollars involved are 338,000,000 and we spent 45 minutes discussing how we...whether or not we were going to appropriate an additional 1,000,000 dollars to bilingual education, one of the 21 categorical grant programs. During that discussion there was no talk at all about whether 1,000,000 dollars would buy ten more teachers or twenty more classrooms or how many students it would affect. The only thing that...the only discussion we had was whether bilingual education was good or bad. And all we were doing, really, was...was deciding whether we were going to appropriate an additional 1,000,000 dollars or not. And I would urge that the kind of discussion that we had here on the floor of the House would much better take place among school district board members. We've heard an awful lot of talk this Session about local control. We've heard a lot of talk about state mandates. And what Amendment #24 does is give you an opportunity to return the decision of how money is going to be spent to local school districts. What Amendment #24 does is take all of the 338,000,000 dollars appropriated to categorical grants and reduces them all to zero. What my intention is, is that if this money is removed from the categorical grant programs, is to put that 338,000,000 dollars into the State Aid Formula. We should not be standing on the floor of this House without any knowledge of what is going on in the school districts and making the decision of how much in particular dollar amounts should be spent for individual particular categorical grant programs. Those decisions should be made at the school, local school board level. We don't know whether the Chicago School Board can...can adequately spend 10,000,000 dollars for bilingual education or all of the downstate and suburban school districts can spend 4½ million dollars. We don't know how many teachers that's buying. We don't know how many textbooks that's



buying. How many students that's educating. The same with all the other categorical grant programs. There are three different adult education programs. Two different gifted programs. Six different special ed programs. Two different bilingual programs and on and on and on. What I'm saying is that we should be...we should make one decision on education, one funding decision, one decision on how that money should be distributed. Those decisions should be made in the School Aid Formula and I think all of this debate and noise and pressure that we get to spend particular number of dollars on particular programs should be directed to local school board members, let them decide how many dollars they have should be spent on each individual program. And I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #24."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Meyer: "Representative Kane, would this do away with the textbook program?"

Kane: "No. What this would do is change the funding of the textbook program from a particular categorical grant program into the State Aid Formula. The school districts would still get the same number of dollars. We're not talking about...."

Meyer: "Well, let me be specific. The Catholic schools would not get the textbooks, correct?"

Kane: "If they were not in the...in the...."

Meyer: "If I may address myself to the Bill, Mr...the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Meyer: "This is the most blatant anti-Catholic Amendment I've seen this year."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Kane, speaking specifically to the adult education line item. Some of those adult education programs are operated by private organizations as opposed to public school systems. How would they be affected by your change of putting the adult education dollars into the formula?"



Kane: "The local school districts would have to contract with them."

Madison: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Kane: "The local school districts would have to contract with them."

Madison: "So then the decision as to...of the rates to be spent for adult education programs would then be made by the local school district rather than set by this General Assembly?"

Kane: "The amount of dollars, yes."

Madison: "I'm sorry, I didn't understand you."

Kane: "The amount of dollars, yes."

Madison: "I see. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. Who? McClain. From Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, the reason why I'm chuckling, would you please strike from the record that I came from Cook.... I mean, I have enough trouble with some of my opponents during election."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

McClain: "No, I have a few questions, if you would...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh."

McClain: "Please, Sir."

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

McClain: "Mr. Kane, would you please inform me as to how much federal dollars we might lose if you're successful?"

Kane: "None that I know of. This does not...this does not address itself to the federal dollars, only to the state dollars."

McClain: "Well, if we...if we reduce the amount of money from the state then we don't receive the matching dollars from the feds, there would be an impact. Do you have any idea on how much that impact would be?"

Kane: "For the dollars...."

McClain: "....And others."

Kane: "The dollars would go through the formula rather than through special categorical grants."

McClain: "How....Doug, how can that be when they're not...when...there... it's a match? A formula match. How can the formula match it if we don't have the category?"

Kane: "The local school districts to provide...whatever match was needed."

McClain: "It...well, you got.... First of all, you're presuming then



the local school districts will do that. And second of all, you have a lack of continuity wherein the...the state now is the coordinating agency for receiving those federal dollars."

Kane: "Well, if you think all knowledge lies in centralized government then you could make that argument, yes."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, on the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

McClain: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Kane means well but I think he has...he has not thought through this Amendment. It has substantial effect on the amount of federal dollars we receive. Indeed, if you're talking about a state coordination of comprehensive education, vocational and technical education, cooperative education, work study and others, what you're really talking about as a cooperative, conscientious and a comprehensive plan state-wide, we would lose those...those federal dollars which would be substantial. For those of you that are Republicans, and if you'll recall the editorials in the Chicago Sun-Times and others, speaking to the amount of federal dollars Governor Thompson is losing, this kind of Amendment will have a significant impact, even more so on those kinds of editorials. I stand here very strongly in opposition to this Amendment and I would advise everyone to please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question? Mr. Sponsor, I just heard a comment made by one of the prior speakers that said that this...this Amendment is anti-Catholic. Is that true?"

Kane: "You'd have to ask the maker of that statement. I didn't make that statement."

Geo-Karis: "Well, is it true in your opinion?"

Kane: "No."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer, to respond to the question."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, if I may point out for the Lady from Lake County. This...this Amendment will abolish the textbook program. There...the other programs that he seeks to...money that he says can be replaced can't be replaced. And what...what happens is that public education



gets over 2,000,000,000 dollars in the State of Illinois. Presently, private education, via the textbook program, gets about 3,000,000. And quite frankly, Mrs. Geo-Karis, there are those around here that don't even want the Catholic schools and the other private schools to get the 3,000,000."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of this Amendment, in my estimation, is one of the Gentlemen in this House who probably has a...one of the greatest interests in the Legislature as an institution and in the proper organization and operation of state government and I admire him for that. I think what he is trying to do here is to point out to us that what we have done as a Legislature over the years is continually added category to category to our education budget while at the same time talking about the needs of local government, separating the two, causing confusion, causing pressures where they should not be and causing some waste in some areas of government. I agree with the general thrust of what the Gentleman intends to do with his Amendment here. I would say to him here that I would join with him over the summer at any time to work out whatever rules or whatever laws might be necessary for introduction next Session to take some of these categories out and to include more of the funds into the distributive fund. And I know by what he is doing here he is attempting to make a point and that point being, is, that is a direction we must go in. And I agree with him in that regard. We cannot, however, and I'm sure that the Gentleman from Sangamon understands that, we cannot at this stage of the game adopt this Amendment reducing all categoricals to zero. But at least in three-fourths of what he is suggesting here, I think he's correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the...two things have to be pointed out in deference to both the Sponsor of the legislation of this Amendment and to the last speaker. One is that you can't abolish all of these programs just simply by refusing to fund gifted, special education, handicapped, transportation, driver's education, lunch programs, bilingual, textbooks and all the other on and ongoing programs that we, the General Assembly, have adopted into statute."



Now I say that at anytime that the Gentlemen that advocate the reduction of any of these categorical grant programs really want to address themselves to that specific issue they shouldn't come in here with howitzer or a shotgun, they should come in here with a specific Bill to do away with a specific program and argue the merits or demerits and the ability of that program to function in this current social conditions. Now, the emphasis up until last year has been to expand programs not to cut back because many Members of the General Assembly found that specific problems weren't being handled at the local school district especially in the areas of gifted, especially in the areas of the handicapped and the specially educated child, that these children were not being handled properly by many local school districts. And Legislators in their wise ways over the years have created these grant programs to insure the fact that those special children will have the opportunity to have a quality education guaranteed under our State Constitution. So I suggest to those advocates of cutting back on any of the grant programs that that would be the way to do it by coming in here with legislation abolishing the statutory language that creates those kinds of conditions. Second of all, my biggest point, in objection to this Amendment #24 is the fact that there is a theory and a myth going around that should be nipped in the bud. And that theory is, that if we cut the categorical grants that somehow automatically these funds will always find themselves(sic) being shifted to the General Fund Formula funding. Well, I could just say to you that there's a lot of needs in our society and not every Member of this General Assembly believes education is the number one priority. And if you allow a reduction in categorical grants I predict to you that the people interested in mental health, the people interested in corrections, the people interested in public health and all the other General Revenue funded programs that this state guarantees to its citizens will find a piece of that money. It will not automatically go to your school districts to provide a quality...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Hanahan: "Education to kids. So, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, philosophically, we must nip this myth in the bud that somehow these funds will be shifted to the General Fund Appropriation. That's a lie,



it's a big lie because if you look at the history it just don't happen that way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Amendment does, contrary to what some of the other speakers have said, it does not abolish the mandates. We have mandates and statutes for school districts to teach English, to teach math, to teach physical education but we don't sit up here and allocate money by those categories and at the same way....we can mandate adult education and gifted and special education, but we don't have to appropriate money by those categories. What this Amendment simply does is change the way that we're going to fund school districts, leave the specific mandates there, but leave the decision on how much dollars should go into each of those programs to the local school boards. That's where that decision should be made, where they can talk about how many teachers a dollar will provide, how many textbooks, how many pupils need to be taught and we should not be doing it here for the whole state without any knowledge of what the specific impacts will be on specific school districts. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #24."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #24 be adopted? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Gentleman from... from Madison, Mr. Lucco, to explain is vote. Timer's on."

Lucco: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise not to influence anyone's vote--I think though that some people's votes might be influenced by the lottery that's now going--I do want to rise, as Representative Peters did very honorably over there, I want to compliment Doctor Kane for the fine job that he has done in putting this together. I'm not too sure whether Doctor Kane is ahead of his time. I think maybe he's ten years behind his time in that this is something that someone should have come up with ten, fifteen years ago before we, the Legislature, got ourselves involved in every year setting up a school aid formula. Again, I'm not saying I'm going to support this Bill but I want you to know that this is one of the most creative things that has come on the House floor in quite some time and I want to compliment Doctor Kane. How do I vote? I'm going to give him a green vote."



Speaker Lechowicz: "It's tough for the third party. Have all voted who wish. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record.

This question there are 28 'ayes', 115 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'.

The Amendment fails."

(Continued on Page 110)



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #25, Hanahan, amends House Bill 2632 as amended on Page 3, line 22."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Whose Amendment is it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan. Amendment #25."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment has just been brought to the attention of the Sponsor of the Bill because the programs of transferring federal funds happen daily. We happen to have this while we're presently hearing the Bill on Second Reading. If it were available for the Committee I would have had it presented there. But all it is is for the federal Nutrition and Education and Training Fund, the federal funds and the allocation of the spending....total of 486 thousand, 9 hundred and 93 dollars of the federal funds to be spent in the various ways for that particular program. Secondly, from the federal funds, 858 thousand, 1 hundred and 40 dollars for the reimbursements of the local education agencies for promotion of model, nutrition, education programs and teaching strategy. It's Representative Peters' and my Amendment and it has been agreed upon on both sides of the aisle....for the allocation of these federal funds that we receive but must present to the Legislature in the manner in which they are allowed to be expended by our state Office of Education. And I move for it's adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if my colleague would answer a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Will this....will this lead school systems to discourage children from using excessive amounts of sugar?"

Hanahan: "I believe it's not anything nutritious..which probably I'm not familiar with all this....the aspects, but I'm sure it's



in smoking, alcohol, anything that would ruin nutrition would probably be taught...two different ways. One on training and educating for the Nutrition and Education Act and the other is for the teaching of the model programs and the teaching strategies in order to accomplish that desired effect."

Skinner: "That's a fascinating idea. I would observe that it is somewhat ironical that the federal government is increasing sugar subsidies while we're talking here about sending money to local school systems to stop kids from eating sugar."

Hanahan: "They do the same thing on smoking, Cal. And you and I, both, disagree on the subsidies of the tobacco industry but a....but they still do it."

Skinner: "The federal government does the same thing on peanuts. The price of peanuts would be half the cost that they are now if we didn't have a President from Georgia."

Hanahan: "But peanuts are very nutritious, so I'd have to recommend that...."

Skinner: "Then we should encourage people to eat them by eliminating the subsidy thereby cutting the price in half. Thank you."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Hanahan has adequately described the Amendment and I would join with him and....respectfully request the approval of the House in the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #25 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', aye, all opposed.....Amendment #25 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #26, Robinson, amends House Bill 2632 on Page 7, line 34 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."



~~Schneider:~~ "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. This term, I think, some of us gained a new awareness about the deaf and the blind with some of the proposals that came before the Legislature. To that end, as we look at the role of education and it's responsibility to that community, I have noted for the last three, possibly four years that one of the line items in the budget has really always been allocated, but never been spent. We know, for example, that up until recent history at least, that a proposal to develop a deaf-blind center has failed to buy the.....or gain title to the land for the construction, has not provided adequate money for capital construction of that building and has really allocated over those years somewhere in the vicinity of a million dollars for operations. Yet today, as I looked at the allocation again, what we noted is that we have allocated over 1.3 million dollars for this particular program which never really gets utilized. What occurred last year is I think the first indication that some money was spent....that is 7 thousand dollars. Seven thousand dollars does not, in my judgment, represent a serious commitment to a program dedicated to the deaf and the blind. We already have such a program in the Southern part of the state and I understand that it is fully staffed. By contrast I have noted, that the program for the North has yet to identify one child in that program for the purposes that that line item serves. So what I am asking at least....and perhaps the Sponsor can help us, is that if we allocate the money, that we ought to get some kind of direction on whether or not it will be spent. And if it is not spent, why not. And if we need to allocate it this year, that's fine with me, but I have sensed that probably again, this money will be allocated and will not be spent. And we have let the money be wasted for a good cause.....for causes that could be just in another area. So let me suggest to the Sponsor



that somehow he explain whether or not that money is going to be spent if it is allocated. If not, then I would ask that this Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a joint Sponsor of this Amendment that takes 1 million, 300 thousand dollars out of the budget. And one of the reasons I am jointly sponsored on this is because the money is not being spent. If the state has a million, 300 thousand dollars to spend on services for the blind and services for the deaf, let's spend it. And if it can't be spent out of the education budget, let's put this money into DVR. Let's put this money into Public Health. Let's put this money into Children and Family Services. If we allow a million, 300 thousand dollars to go into the budget and sit there in '74, '75, '76, '77, '78 and '79, never to be used, it's nothing but a fraud and a publicity gimmick. Now the Senator, Senator Rock, who originally put this into the state's budget has this year consistently voted against programs for the blind and for the deaf over in the Senate. And if this merely his publicity way of wriggling out of his votes against social service programs for the blind and the deaf, then I say let's not let him get away from it. On the other hand, if there's a commitment from Representative Hanahan, the Sponsor of this Bill, that this money will be used, then we would be willing to withdraw this Amendment."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, Representative Robinson is the chief Cosponsor of the Bill. I just wanted to let you know that I believe the City Council has already approved for the transfer of the building for Representative 'Martwick' for this purpose. And so I think that that is the first step in saying that there is a commitment that it will be used."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I could assure the Sponsor of this Amendment that these funds are beingand right now have been approved for expenditure in this coming fiscal year. I might point out that in the Chicago area the old Municipal Tuberculosis Sanitarium area is the site chosen to construct the deaf-blind center for the metropolitan Northern Illinois, statewide..... Northern Illinois area service center. Now this....these monies have already been considered in the bag...if I might say that way, because we're already trying to construct this facility. And I would suggest that the.... that I too sometimes get chagrined about the slowness of state government in providing the facility that we at one time feel so necessary and we find three years later they haven't constructed. But these monies are needed. And to strike this fund out of the operation in grant program would be an error at this time because we do have the 130 some children who are already identified of having both an infliction of deaf...being deaf and blind, with a site already chosen, with contracts being let to construct at the old Municipal Sanitarian District up at Foster and Crawford Avenue or Pulaski Road...whatever they call that up in that area, for the facility. So I suggest that this Amendment should be withdrawn in view of that knowledge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to close."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Tom, I don't want to get into the dialogue, but it would help my point of view if you could tell me if they have identified kids now for the facility."

Hanahan: "Yes, there is 130 pupils between the age of 3 and 21 have been identified already in this state needing the facility."

Schneider: "How about in Cook County out of that group or is



...serving the state? Total state service?"

Hanahan: "It's about 50% according to my analysis."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and Members, with the assurances that Representative Brady and Hanahan have given and I assume Representative Robinson will be pleased....I would like to withdraw the Amendment. Next year we will look at the expenditure one more time. And I hope that the allocation will have been utilized because I think there could not be a finer and more important thing that has to be done with schools than this. This is a....so I will ask....Mr. Speaker, withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #26 is withdrawn. Now Representative Anderson posed a question to the Chair before, as far as the germaneness of Amendment #10. And in the opinion of this Chair, the Amendment is germane and in proper order. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #27, Peters, amends House Bill 2632 as amended...."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment 27 reduces a line item in the budget in regard to vocational education from 26 million, 870 thousand to 20 million dollars: in a reduction of 6.8 million dollars. The 20 million is still approximately 1.8 million over the year before. I solicit your consideration and support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, it was pointed out in the Education Subcommittee, which I had the privilege and honor to Chair, that even the State of Ohio funds it's vocational education....education funding at 40 million dollars out of general revenue funds. We, in Illinois, are asking under the House Bill 2632 to fund our vocational education at 26 million, 8 hundred and 70 thousand dollars. Now I've gone around the state enough in the areas of vocational education in apprenticeship



training to recognize that of all the things that I've heard from our constituents is a greater need for apprenticeship and greater need for vocational education centers. Not every kid going through school wants to learn algebra and geometry and trigonometry. Not every kid that we send to high school wants to become a teacher or a nurse or a doctor or a lawyer or even a Legislator. There are too many kids today that have not been given the proper avocation of becoming a tradesman or becoming a skilled mechanic by learning in high school an appreciable trade where he will be able to be an asset to society instead of a frustrated human being who is overeducated for some of his job titles that we now have in our society. I just suggest to you, Members of the General Assembly, that if anything were needed in vocational education in the State of Illinois today, it would be an increase in our funding and I'm just sorry that we can't afford more than 26 million, 8 hundred and 70 thousand dollars. And for this Amendment to be adopted would be a travesty with the suggestion that too many of our mothers and fathers around this state recognized too late that our kids are being frustrated with academic nonsense instead of being taught a decent ability...having a decent ability to learn something about sheet metal work or something about electricity or plumbing or all the other....automobile mechanic or automobile repair work, all the various vocational educational skills that could only be acquired at a young age in high school. So I ask for an negative vote, a 'no' vote, on this Amendment that would destroy the concept that we needvocational education in this state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have before me the recommendation of the State Board of Education at the allocation levels as provided in the Governor's budget. When the State Board of



Education looked at the appropriations for '78-'79 or FY '79, that they had originally recommended and then applied the Governor's funding level to those programs, they reduced vocational education from the 26 million, 8 hundred and 70 thousand dollars to 21 million, 5 hundred thousand dollars. Representative Peters is suggesting that we fund this at 20 million dollars, which as he pointed out correctly, there's approximately a million dollars higher than it is being funded at this year. The suggestion that there is any interest in destroying vocational education in this state by giving them a million dollars more than they got last year.....seems to me to be....not particularly well founded. Representative Peters is suggesting that we increase vocational education by a million dollars. I, for one, would not vote....would not increase it by one thin dime. Those schools which provide vocational education are.....these students are also counted in the General Distributive Fund. And that's where the money ought to be put. And for that reason, I rise in support of Representative Peters' Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose this Amendment. I'm here to tell you that I spent many years in the education field before I came to this General Assembly. I also live in a community where we have a state penitentiary, a correctional institution. Let me tell you..... these vocational programs are for those students, many of those students, who along about the freshman, sophomore year of school get tired and have no interest in the academic program. They care less about English, history and things like that....so they become dropouts. The first thing they start doing is stealing, many things of that nature to have a few dollars and finally wind up in a correctional school or in the penitentiary. And let me tell you, every school district board with administration have



prepared a vocational plan - the one year plan and the five year plan. I don't need to tell you if you'll just think.....to have vocational programs, they have smaller classes, they have more expense. They'll put 25 or 30 in an English class or a social study class, but they have 10, 12 and maybe that's the maximum that they have in these vocational areas. Our school boards have planned ahead for five years ahead to provide the facility, the instructors for these kids. Now here we're trying to take away money that is much better spent to educate these youngsters so that they have a salable skill....something that they can go out into society and so we can keep them in school. Then someone says in the Committee the other day, we have our junior colleges. That's where we have these programs for them. How in the name of God are you going to get them to the junior college, if they don't get a high school diploma. We have to keep their interests in school. We have to keep them there until they get that high school diploma before they get to that junior college. I ask you to consider these things and vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that's a hard act to follow. But I think one of our previous speakers, the Sponsor of the Bill, has been somewhat misleading in telling us that Ohio spends 40 million dollars on vocational education and would like to make you think that we spend less than that. Even if this Amendment is adopted, we would be spending more than 55 million dollars on vocational education next year. In addition to this particular line item which the Sponsor of the Amendment plans to reduce, we have another portion of the Office of Education Budget which includes federal funding. And if you look at that part of the budget you will see that we have 6 million dollars in one line item, \$5.2 million in another, 20



million dollars in yet another one, 2 million in another and several other smaller line items. Those items are not being reduced by this Amendment. They will be there. Add that to the 20 million that will be left in this line item if this Amendment passes and you will find that Illinois would still be expending in excess of 55 million dollars for vocational education. I don't want to deprive vocational education of dollars, but I think we do have an obligation to set some priorities. I cannot justify going back to my local school districts and telling them that they are not going to get as much money as in the distributive aid formula as they got last year. I want to reserve as much of our state money as possible to go in to the distributive aid formula and I urge your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was working on this issue early this morning and I think that one of the things we have to keep our attention focused to is that some of these programs, particularly vocational education, is critical to keeping people in the mainstream. We talked about that in terms of the Spanish speaking Amendment and we talked about that in terms of the bilingual program in that area. This Amendment is cutting the guts out of the program. This Amendment is an effort really to take away from people who most need educational opportunities...that chance to become involved in the educational process. And then become full participants in the economic system. I would urge a 'no' vote on Amendment #27."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I also would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment. What some of the Body might not realize is that this same Amendment amount was offered in the Appropriation Committee to reduce this item to that



and it was defeated...in the Appropriations Committee. I think that speaks for the Committee's feeling on it. I would like to echo on the floor that I don't think we should be in a posture of cutting vocational education on the basis that we can put it in another arena of education and therefore serve our district better. I think education needs adequate funding in all areas. And certainly, vocational education is not one of the areas that we should slight. I urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to close."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate your consideration of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #27 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. All all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 28 'ayes', 102 'nays', 1 recorded 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #28....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Van Duyne, 'no'. Collins....."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Jane Barnes, amends House Bill 2632 as amended in Section 3 by deleting the following....and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Collins wants to be recorded as 'present' on that last.....Amendment....and the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that you called on Jane Barnes to speak on Amendment #28. Now I have in my hand Amendment #28 and it says Hanahan, Sir. Therefore, I must.....I assume that Jane Barnes.....is out of order with her Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me look up the Amendment, Jack. On the Amendment that was filed with the Clerk....Amendment #28 is Jane M. Barnes and Mr. Brady. And the Lady from Cook,



Mrs. Barnes: "Try a different mike, Janie."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to table Amendment #28."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady wants to withdraw Amendment #28. Hearing no objection, the Amendment is withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #29, Jane Barnes, amends House Bill 2632 as amended in Section 3 and so forth."

Barnes: "Ladies and Gentlemen and Mr. Speaker, Amendment #29 calls for an increase of funds for the textbook program of 9 million dollars to 11 million dollars. And I would like to point out that in the first year of this program we were allocated 3 1/2 million. We were able to fund kindergarten through third grade at a cost of approximately \$3.47 per textbook. The next year we were allocated 7 million. We were able to fund fourth grade through seventh grade at an average of \$6.52 per textbook. This next year it would be my anticipation that we could fund eighth grade through twelfth grade and the average textbook would be \$9.00 a book. And if any of you can recall, a full textbook program would call for a funding of 27 million. So I really feel that 11 million would be very much in order to further this textbook program. This program has become a very, very popular program in the last two years and a Mr. Wright, who was the Regional Superintendent of Schools in DuPage, recently put out a press release and he said, 'public, private and parochial schools are demonstrating a continued strong interest during their second year of participation in this state's secular textbook loan program. I think the textbook program is a very equitable program because it is open to any child in the State of Illinois that cares to participate in this program. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I rise to support



Representative Jane Barnes in her motion to make this line item 11 million dollars. I think we have seen already across the State of Illinois how this has helped. Providing the basic tool can in no way jeopardize one's future in education, regardless of who is getting it. It's a program open to all in Illinois. It's servicing students in both the public and private sector. I think it is a very important progressive step that she is taking. She is asking, I believe, for a reasonable amount of money. In the overall education budget of this state, it is minute. And I urge your support of this motion."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I don't have Amendment #29 ...and I wonder if it's been distributed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's been distributed. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Well in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call so that all the school children of Illinois can continue to participate in what I consider a very worthwhile program."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #29 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, a good thing is pretty good but this is a lot of really good things in this now and we have 9 million dollars in the program and I think that's going to be an adequate amount of money according to Doctor Cronin in Committee to purchase the textbooks for everybody that needed them...from grade 8 to grade 12. I do think the program is helping. I've talked to a number of school people and I do think that, but I think we need to use a little common sense here. It is the taxpayer's money that we're voting to give away. I probably should vote for it....I even own some publishing stock...and...."



but I think the best vote would be a 'no' vote...at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 104 'ayes', 41 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #30, Skinner, amends House Bill....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Why should we use a scalpel when we can use a meat ax. This is a meat ax on....this is a meat ax on...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is....."

Skinner: "....on bilingual education. It absolutely guts the program, both downstate and in Chicago. And I think that says it all. Say it in Polish, Ted, yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: (Foreign language) "That means, not today, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Why not?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if the Gentleman was sincere, he would not be offering an Amendment to strike the financial assistance that is mandated and necessary for us to receive both federal funds from the federal government in order to provide bilingual education to many of our citizens around the state. But he would be attacking the very statutory language that is in our statutes. And this is not really the proper....it may be technically all right but it's not really the proper way of attacking a much needed program. And I think enough has been said on the manner of....of bilingual education. I don't think anyone in their....in sincere approach to voting as a Legislator would really appreciate just abolishing all bilingual programs in the state, both in the city and Cook County and downstate. This is a very bad Amendment. It would completely demolish and completely



thwart every effort that we need to make in order to provide our citizens of Illinois with the proper tools so that they can meet....in today's society all the frustrations and all the various technical knowledge that they need that bilingual education will help them....be provided with. So I ask for a 'no' vote on this Amendment #30."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #30 beoh....the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "I didn't know my colleague spoke for the illegal aliens in our district. Most of the people who are of Spanish surnames in our district who are citizens, can speak English and do need this. I would suggest that if the Gentleman wishes me to change the statute, he should make a contribution to the Skinner for Congress Committee or something like that....I'd be happy to try to do so. But this is money that could go to our local school districts, to the General Distributive Fund....it's about 10 million dollars now. Why shouldn't we put it in the local schools where they can decide where to spend it? If they want to spend it educating illegal aliens, let them. If they want to spend it educating citizens, which I would prefer, let them make the decision."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #30 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed....."

Skinner: "Roll Call....Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #30 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Come on, Marco, I'm 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 31 'ayes', 88 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Filed with the Clerk is a motion by Representative Jesse Madison, where he moves to table Amendment #15 to House Bill 2632. The



~~Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, on his motion.~~"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when House Bill 2632 came to Committee....came to Committee with a category of 15 million dollars for desegregation assistance. Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let him continue on his motion....you can raise your point later."

Madison: "It was a Committee Amendment, Mr. Speaker, to completely remove the 15 million dollars for desegregation assistance out of this budget. And that Amendment was adopted. I filed this motion, Mr. Speaker, for the specific reason of having this General Assembly once and for all go on record as to where the State of Illinois stands in relationship to desegregation. Now, I'm....understand, Mr. Speaker, that there is a theory that says that discretion is a better part of valor and it is in the interest of that theory and because I don't want to set the record for the number of nobles....that I will move to table my motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved to table his motion. Any opposition? Hearing none, the motion is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2973. Mr. Abramson. Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I filed a motion and it's on page 13... that may not be too lucky a number but....on page 13, a motion to move HJCA 53 to Second Reading. I'd like to call that motion now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're a.....let me tell you the intent of the Chair. The intent of the Chair at the request of the Speaker, is to go through page 2, Second Readings. If you'll look at the calendar, I think that that will suffice as far as the work load of this House for this afternoon and this evening. Hopefully, we will be out of here by 9 o'clock. Well....you take a look at the number



of Bills and the number of Amendments and if we get through by six, I'm with you. So....House Bill 2973, Mr. Abramson."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, what's your intention toward my motion?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get to it when we get through with this."

Byers: "Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2973. A Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Industrial Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1, 2, and 3 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to take this Bill out of the record, Sir? I'm not guaranteeing we'll get back to it. House Bill 2978. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2978. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Fair Employment Practices Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #3 by Representative Catania."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, on the motion to table Amendment #3."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I think there were motions to table 2, 3 and 4.....2 and 3 because they became incorporated in 4."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motions to table Amendments 2, 3 and 4. By Representative Catania."

Catania: "I'd like to consider the motions to table Amendments 2 and 3 together, if I may, because both of those became incorporated in Amendment #4. I move to table 2 and 3 and then consider the motion to table Amendment 4 later."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves to table Amendments 2 and 3 and with the intention that it is supposed to be contained



in Amendment #4. Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Just so I have it clear, does Amendment #4 incorporate what was in Amendments 2 and 3?"

Catania: "That's my understanding."

Houlihan: "All right, fine, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hearing no objections, Amendments 2 and 3 are tabled. The Lady from Cook, on Amendment #4."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to table Amendment #4. It does include the reductions that were adopted in Committee. This happened about four weeks ago. Since then I trust that the people who supported that reduction have been persuaded that the FEPC is in fact acting in good faith and does in fact, need that money. And I move to table Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am, which Appropriation Committee heard this Bill?"

Catania: "This was Appropriations II."

Speaker Lechowicz: Mr. Barnes....is he on the floor? The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I was just wondering....I wasn't on that Appropriations Committee, but I thought we just tabled 2 and 3 because they were going to be adopted in 4."

Catania: "Incorporated in 4....the reductions had been placed into 4...so...4 is the one that now has the total cut. And I'm moving to table that because the FEPC does in fact need the money. And I have discussed it with some Members of your Appropriations Committee, but not all."

Tipsword: "All I was saying was that I think a lot of people thought from the way you presented it....that we are wiping out 2 and 3 because they were going to be incorporated in #4."

Catania: "They are incorporated in 4 and....it's because...."

Tipsword: "It was a question that was specifically asked of you in fact."



Catania: "Yes, they are incorporated in 4....."

Tipsword: "...for that purpose. You didn't say you were going to then take 4 out."

Catania: "The cuts that were in 2 and 3 are now in 4 and we are now on Amendment #4. The question is, do we want to table that Amendment which was adopted in Committee? And I am moving to table that Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, could you have the Clerk read that? I have my explanation in our analysis from the Committee that Amendment #4 is the reduction in revenue travel by 7 thousand dollars which the....the Chairman, in fact, indicated it was not....was a legitimate reduction because they were making one time trips to Washington to develop a new program. We reduced that and the Chairman really had no opposition to Amendment number....what I thought was Amendment #4 in Committee. I think Representative Catania is in error in her description of what we're dealing with."

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

Leverenz: "I don't find....I have Amendments 7, 6 and 5, 3 and 2. I don't have #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Has the Amendment been distributed? The Amendment has been distributed, Mr. Leverenz. We'll try to get you a copy of the Amendment. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, the reason it was necessary for 2 and 3well, Amendment #2 deleted everything after the enacting clause. Amendment #3 deleted everything after the enacting clause and Amendment #4 deleted everything after the enacting clause. The reason it is necessary to table those two....to deal with 4 is so...the intent of Representative Catania is to get back to the original Bill as it was originally introduced. If she were to simply make a motion to table Amendment #4 and that motion



was successful, then we'd be back in the posture of the Bill with Amendment #3. And so she's attempting...she's motioned to table 2 and 3 so that if 4 is successful the Bill will be back in it's original posture when it was introduced."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #4 be tabled? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed say 'nay'. Amendment #4 is tabled. A Roll Call has been requested. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, to close on Amendment #4."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, there is some question about this on the Republican side. May I take it out of the record temporarily and may I also clear it up...because the problem was a staff problem on the Democratic side. I would like to come back it, however, if I may."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks leave to take the Bill out of the record temporarily. But...Amendments 2 and 3 are tabled. Hearing no objection, the Bill is out of the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I don't object to her taking it out of the record, but I object to her commenting about it being a staff problem on the Democratic side. I think that's gratuitous..a libel on the Democratic staff and on all our staff that worked very hard and has worked long hours and particularly in the appropriations process."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It is only human to make errors, it's divine to forgive."

Houlihan: "I forgive her."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3069. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3069. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to various Commissions and Committees. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 were adopted in Committee."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "If there are no further Amendments....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, Wikoff, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by Amendment #1 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff, on Amendment #11."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I'd move to withdraw that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to withdraw Amendment #11. The Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amend.... let me just point out to the House, that there are 96 Amendments filed on this Bill so....it will be awhile. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Schuneman, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by Amendment #1....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #12 was submitted to cut back on the budget of the Commission on the Status of Women. Largely, Mr. Speaker, because....out of a fear on the part of some people that this Commission is being used and could be used as a manner of the State of Illinois providing funds for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. And it was on the basis of that that I did have a discussion with the Chairman of that Commission and she has assured me that even though the Equal Rights Amendment has not yet been ratified in Illinois....and there is time left yet, until sometime next March, that none of these funds will be used for that purpose. And it's on the basis of that promise from the Chairman of this Commission that I withdraw Amendment #12."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #12. Hearing no objection, the Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, Peters, amends House Bill 3069 as amended on Page 1 and so forth."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask to withdraw the Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You withdrew the Amendment? The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw the Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, the Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #14, J.M. Houlihan, amends House...."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment makes a technical change on the page number and it sets up the public utility fund appropriation....there is no change except to correct page...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the technical Amendment. Any discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #14 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed....Amendment #14 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, Kelly-Geo-Karis, amends House Bill...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly. 15."

Kelly: "Yes, I move for the adoption of Amendment #15. This particular Amendment provides 30 thousand dollars to be used for the research of the substance ethanol, which is a fuel product which is developed from agricultural pro... agricultural and waste materials. This is very much of a enviromental issue which is going on throughout our neighboring states which are in the agricultural field. We're trying to come up with a substitute fuel which would combine unleaded fuel of 90% with 10% of this ethanol which is a gasoline byproduct. And I would ask for thisthese funds. I would like to point out that this Amendment does not call for the use of these funds unless the federal government is willing to equally participate



in this program. So, if they are not, then these funds will not be used and this will not be an increase in this budget. And I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Mahar: "Dick, you have this same Amendment on 3385 as I understand. Is there a reason for that?"

Kelly: "Yes, there is, Bill. The reason is, I'm not sure which one of these Bills are going to clear and I'm gonna.... and I also have another Amendment which I'm going to table so.....that's why I have it on there. Somewhere along the line it will be tabled."

Mahar: "O.K."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #15 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposedAmendment #15 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan. Sixteen, Tom."

Clerk O'Brien: "....by deleting Section 1."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, having served on the Atomic Energy Commission when there was no funding, back in 1965 and 66, I could assure the Membership of the General Assembly that if we didn't have the Commission it would be probably just as well and to delete the amount of money for the appropriation...the people of Illinois will be served just as well without that funding. And I move it's adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that...on the question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think I'm known as one of the big spenders around



here. But I do have to rise in defense of the work that the Commission on Atomic Energy has done and the services it has provided its people....the people of the State of Illinois. I don't have to remind you, I don't believe, that the question of nuclear power and the question of how we are to provide energy for our country is becoming of greater concern as the days go by. And the nuclear industry is highly involved and is an integral part of whether we will be able to provide energy in the form and in the quantity that we need it or not. Also the matter of nuclear waste and none of us would deny that that is a serious problem. But this particular Commission has devoted its attention and its energy to these problems without out which, I feel, that our country will fall sharply behind at a time in our country's history when we can ill-afford to become second rate in anything and that includes the matter of nuclear power and its proper and safe use. So I would urge, Ladies and Gentlemen, my colleagues, that this Amendment not be adopted. The budget overall over the years...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry about theif we....I'd like to ask you, maybe you know without the Parliamentarian, but if we knocked out Section 1 would that knock all the other Sections out numerically.... in numerical order and cause them to be ineffective also?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It would not. You just have to defeat the Amendment. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the information of the Body, Amendment 16 begins a series of Amendments Sponsored by Representative Hanahan, Representative Martin, myself and Representative Kane that attempt to do something that was attempted last year in an omnibus....or in a Bill filed by Representative Totten which did not prevail. We are taking this approach by way of Amendment to give this



Body a chance to defend their particular past, if you will, their Commissions. Each of the succeeding Amendments will do the same thing. They will eliminate Commission government in the State of Illinois. So you better all pay attention if you want to fight for your Commissions on a Roll Call vote. Now each one will be different, naturally, because each Amendment deals with a different Commission. I was astounded to learn from Representative Hanahan, the principal Sponsor of this series of Amendments, that in 1965, Governor Otto Kerner vetoed all Commission Bills in the State of Illinois. And the State of Illinois suffered no loss from that, in fact, seemed to go along admirably well in succeeding years until other General Assemblies and governors decided to reinstitute the Commission form of government. I see no need as a fiscal conservative for commission government except those that have a statutory or constitutional authority to do something...to perform some function. I would suggest to you that the argument of public participation in Commissions has no bearing on the financing of those Commissions, we can still have the statutory authority to have the Commissions that are here. Public members can still serve. We just won't fund them. Let them serve...and let them serve well. And let's have that kind of patronage emanating from the Governor's office to let public members participate in the Commission. But the Standing Committees and Subcommittees of this House and of the Senate can well deal with the problems that the Commissions are now dealing with and you'll find that there will be a savings of some 4 million dollars to the taxpayers of Illinois. So I support Amendment #16 and all the ensuing Amendments and won't bother you with any more rhetoric on these subjects."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to close."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not going



to pick on the Atomic Energy Commission as being any different than most other Commissions, but having served as Secretary back when Otto Kerner, the former Governor, had vetoed the appropriation to it, I noticed at that time that we didn't need a lot of meetings. And we didn't need to have a lot of expenditures, personal expenditures, because the taxpayers weren't paying for it. We had no reimbursement at all for that two year period. And I might point out to the Members of this House, we performed a greater service to the people of this world in those two years than in all the years since then, in my judgment, when we were able to bring the Cyclotron, the Batavia Institute, the 'Fermi' Institute in Batavia, Illinois in no debt and advocated and sponsored the legislation to purchase the land that was at one time....a little town outside of Batavia in Kane and DuPage Counties. Judge Morgan was the Chairman of the Committee at the time. But we didn't spend any taxpayers' money. And I notice that in today's appropriation request is the request for 58 thousand, 200 dollars to be expended by a Commission that I think really could be better served and better spent towards the education of children, both vocational for those advocates of wanting to find money for general revenue for the Common School Fund. I suggest that this is a good place to start adding these funds into the general Common School Fund for education of all the kids instead of having a few meals at some fancy hotel and discuss day to day problems that could be paid for out of their own pockets. And I might point out, most of the public Commission Members generally are reimbursed by their private employers to attend. So what...who's kidding who here that we need to spend this amount of money to be sitting around with executives from Commonwealth Edison who are being paid for out of citizens'... utility bills and other kinds of executives worrying about



atomic energy problems or the usage of energy in transportation of waste products in this state. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "16, you mean?"

Hanahan: "16, excuse me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #16. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed The 'noes' have it. Any further Amendments? The Amendment loses."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #17, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting Section 2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Section 2 on this one now. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Status of Women Commission, no different than any other Commission, is a Commission that expends taxpayers dollars to somehow promote themselves for their own advocacy to continue to be in existence. I'm not picking on this Commission any more than any other Commission. I just say that the same statements made of the waste of taxpayers' dollars that could be better spent in the areas of education, better spent in the operations and deliberations of this Body of the General Assembly, be allowing our standing...existing Committees to operate and function would be a better expenditure of these taxpayers' dollars. And I move to adopt Amendment #17 to House Bill 3069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #17. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'noes' have it. You want a Roll Call? The Amendments fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #18, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting Section 3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Energy Resources Commission is another example of 156 thousand,



765 dollars of taxpayers' dollars that could possibly be better spent by the Members of the Committee that are the established Members of this House with their expertise. Most of the public Members on this Commission, like most other Commissions, are reimbursed by private funding, by private enterprise to be in attendance. For the expenditure of the hard earned dollars, the dollars that we take from the working people of Illinois, to be expended for the manner of sitting around discussing the problems of energy resources when.....after they have elected Legislators who have to ultimately make the final decisions. And in some cases, also pay high utility bills and other kinds of public utility bills that would....that serve as Commission Members to these kinds of Commissions. I suggest we could spend the money better in the operation budget of our.... out of the General Revenue Fund that operate all our schools. Plus, the expenditure in our Commissions..... our Committee system of the operations of the General Assembly. And I move for adoption of Amendment #18 to House Bill 3069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the champion of this Bill, certainly amazes me today. He is the champion for education. He is the champion for labor. I want Mr. Hanahan to understand that the Illinois Energy Resources Commission has probably done more to do research in the development of Illinois coal and the development of solar energy, the development of gasohol which creates and will create jobs, employment, businesses in the State of Illinois. I believe that the Illinois Energy Resources Commission is one of the most vital arms of this Legislative Body. It's a very, very important part of the check and balance system of our Democratic system of government. The Governor of Illinois cannot do things without the O.K. of the Energy Resource Commission."



which is a representative Body of this particular House and Senate. And I certainly am amazed at the stand that Representative Hanahan, the champion of labor and the champion of education, can stand up and propose such an Amendment like this. I certainly want to oppose it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #18 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'Roll Call? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Marco, 'no'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Davis: "Not to explain my vote, Sir. On all succeeding Amendments, I would appreciate it if we would have a Roll Call. The voice votes are close on some and I wish that every Member could be recorded on these important abolishment of Commission Bills. So I would suggest and I know I am joined by at least five others, a Roll Call on all succeeding Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 38 'ayes', 83 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #19, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting Section 4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Once again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Commission on Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities is a laudable cause and in no way do I want to.... to suggest, even to former speaker....the last speaker that spoke in opposition to a Commission that he's a Chairman of and very involved in, do I want to suggest that I'm against the Commissions, themselves. What I am against is the waste, the duplicity, the....the absolute nonessential spending of our taxpayers' monies for a Commission to sit and deliberate, no matter how well



intentioned, but to be expended by the taxpayers for somebody to sit around in meetings....generally, being paid... like in this Commission's case, either by other state agencies' salaries or by private organizations that reimburse them at the same time that they are receiving reimbursements for providing a service for Commission on Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. I could tell you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that every time I've attended any Commission meeting we have enjoyed the luxuries of a fine meal, the luxuries of having....meeting in a fine hotel or traveling first class and I want to hear the defense of expenditures of the hard earned taxpayer's money...for expending their money in that manner. Now they may come out with good recommendations, but the facts still are the facts, that it is a waste of taxpayers' money when at the same time we have Committees in the House of Representatives and in the State Senate who ultimately must make the final decision on every recommendation and are not served by public members in their deliberation. So while some Commissions may perform very laudable acts, you and I know there are some that perform nothing. And yet, they spend the taxpayers' money for whatever purposes they seem fit to keep themselves in existence. We have had reams upon reams of mail and of literature being sent to our desks and our offices. How many of you could stand up here and say you've read them, outside of the covers. You know what happens with all these reams of material? We could send them all over to Joe Lucco's Committee and use it for energy....and burn the things and get more out of it than all the written words that are printed and sent to our desks. I could just suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you want to spend 98 thousand, 844 dollars of the taxpayers' money for a bunch of people to sit around and talk about developmental disabilities, that's your prerogative. But as for me, I would sooner



see the House Committee that would most perform in behalf of the people of Illinois....in a beneficial way, deliberate on the needs of those in the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities needs, not to have public members sitting around saying what Legislators should or should not be doing, knowing that they do not have to stand a test at election time....on their actions. So I suggest that this is a good Amendment. If they want to do it, fine, but not to spend taxpayers' money to the tune of 98 thousand dollars and I move for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "The Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "Tom, it seems to me....or I'm in agreement with you, the precedent has been set with the last three or four votes, some of them oral. I wonder if you would consider considering the rest of the Amendments through 26 on one Roll Call?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to consider Amendments 19 through 26 on one Roll Call."

Hanahan: "As far as I'm concerned....the only thing I would like to do before we take it is go through the items because I want every Member to know how much money is being expended for each Commission. So if he wants to call.....ask for one Roll Call, that's fine with me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's fine. Objections were raised.... no, the Lady withdrew her objection and let's.....kindly proceed with Amendments 20, 21....which ones are you eliminating now, Tom? This is 19 through 26 now."

Hanahan: "Right." The next Committee....expends 310 thousand, 500 dollars...Amendment #20, is that right, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "There have been objections raised. No objections? She objects. Amendment #19. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."



Marovitz: "Maybe if I could have a word with Penny we could withdraw that objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you still object, Ma'am? Amendment 19. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, we've got a problem. On the first three Amendments there were voice votes and the Conservative Union won't know how we voted for the tally. I think we ought to go back and take Roll Calls so that Keats, who's observant for the conservation union, will have it accurate. I want to be recorded on these three anyway so that they get the right tally beside my name....you know."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There has been objections raised. We'll go on 19 through 26 individually and....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, on Amendment #19."

Yourell: "Let's have a Roll Call on that objection, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to make that motion, Mr. Yourell?"

Yourell: "Yes, I move....I move that a Roll Call on the motionon the objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I can understand Representative Yourell's position and I intend to agree with that. But, we need leave and there's no way a Roll Call will dispense with leave. It has to be unanimous consent and Representative Pullen is within her rights to object."

Speaker Lechowicz: "O.K. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, on Amendment #19. We're going to consider them individually."

Skinner: "I must admit I've never heard of this Commission, so I'm certainly going to vote for the Gentleman's Amendment. But, I would like to know if he's really a frustrated conservative? He's nodding his head, yes. In which case I would like to know why he ended up number 40 on the Illinois Conservative Union Ranking...."



Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry....that does not apply to Amendment #19. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Chairman, the Commission on Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities has been in existence for about 2 1/2 years. It consists of public members as well as Legislators. The public members have made a great contribution to this Commission. This Commission deals with a department that has a budget of well over 400 million dollars. This Commission acts as a mediator and comes up with constructive ideas that have already saved the state many millions of dollars. It's done a tremendous job considering the thirteen different planning requirements by the state and federal governments. It is addressing itself....just for example and I'll be very brief, with the problem of deinstitutionalization, and also, with alternative living for mentally ill and mentally retarded. This Commission has already paid for itself many times over and is one of the state's....really needs for one basic reason. In the area of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities we have consumer groups and we also have the state bureaucracy. We need an independent, hard working Commission in order to sort out their competing claims and to make recommendations that will save us money and keep us going in the right track in this very sensitive area. I think we really need this Commission. And I can attest to the fact that not one dime has been wasted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #19 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Winnebago....the Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin, to explain her vote. Mrs. Lynn Martin, please."

Martin: "As a Cosponsor of these Amendments, may I suggest to you that while all of us are interested in tax reform and all of us want to help homeowners and senior citizens that one of the ways you help is by not spending money. This



is a total of 1.3 million dollars worth of Commissions. Now if you feel you can go home and justify every single one of them and you can feel you can tell your people you are spending their money wisely, go ahead. But some of these Commissions are absolute turkeys and they should end."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 39 'ayes, 85 'nays', 0 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #20, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting Section 5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madison: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, because I'm a little sick and tired of hearing about this Conservative Union. Any Member of this House knows that if you want to be classified as a big spender all you've got to do is vote for one Bill and that's the Bill to fund public education. And then you end up on the list with the Conservative Union as a big spender. So I wish the Members of this House would refrain from even mentioning the name of the damn Conservative Union."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Pullen: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Pullen: "I want to make it clear that my objection to taking these on one Roll Call has nothing to do with the Conservative Union or with any individual Commission. My objection has to do with the purpose that these Amendments were originally introduced for. They were to break the omnibus Commission Bill into several so that each Commission would stand on its merits. This House passed sunset legislation so that each agency of government would stand on its



merits. And I certainly think that taking individual Roll Calls on Commissions is the first place to start with sunset. My objection to taking these on one Roll Call is in order to keep the purpose for those Amendments. It is farcical to even have the Amendments if we do not hear them individually. And I'm sure that it will not take any more time than yesterday afternoon's discussion did. Thank you."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I find I have to stand and agree with the statements made by my colleague, Representative Madison. I think much has been made about a standing concerning fiscal conservatism passed out by some group. Now....those of you know that last Session a lot of us worked very hard in terms of balancing the budget on both sides of the aisle. My dear friend....and I name him so that you know who he is, Representative Jaffe, prides himself in the district. And I say this because of his courage, he prides himself in the district of being fiscally irresponsible. And he tells that to people at the meetings....that he is there to vote the money for their needs. He says that. And in that listing he came out more conservative than I did. Now that gives you some indication of the value of that particular listing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's get back to Amendment #20. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid will expend under House Bill 3069, 310 thousand, 500 dollars. Now so far anyone that has argued in opposition to these Amendments have yet to state the fact of who serves as members on these Commissions. And I'm not talking about the legislative Members, but who are the public members that are in such dire straits that need to expend the



taxpayers' dollars....like in this case of 310 thousand, 500 dollars. . I say to you, Members of the General Assembly, that if you look behind the facade of contractual services in the line item of personal services and you look behind the facade that we call travel, you will find well-heeled, wealthy individuals generally in other areas of public employment serving as Members on these Commissions making recommendations that they'll never have to be tested on how they recommend the Legislative Members to vote. Now if we want to spend the taxpayer's money foolishly, I suggest there's a lot better ways of doing it. And if you want to spend it more wisely, I would suggest that we give ourselves a pay raise. But if you want to continue to expend hard fought for general revenue funds for the tune of 310 thousand, 500 dollars so a couple of Senators and House Members can fight for who's going to be the Chairman of Public Aid Advisory Committee, we could continue to expend the money by voting 'no' on this Amendment. But if you think that you could better spend it by giving to the various Committees of the House and the Committees of the Senate these amounts of monies to do the work, I suggest that you vote 'aye' on Amendment #20 on House Bill 3069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my good friend, Tommy Hanahan.....I realize that the Legislative Advisory Committee has been a little bit inactive for the past year, but it seems to me that happened over in the Senate over some leadership type of thing. I don't really remember, but I think most of you do. But I could also tell you that the Legislative Advisory Committee over the years was incorporated in 1963 or enacted by statute and that the previous two years in our legislative report, we proved that we brought back to



the state 10 dollars for every dollar that was expended. And I'll tell you, it's a hard working Committee and we have been to Washington a number of times and appraised some of the Gentlemen on.....thank you, Harold. I know you wanted to offer an Amendment before. But while we were in Washington we.....we have garnered and gathered quite a bit of federal money that our Congressman did not understand and also exerted some influences on HEW, which led us to establish some of our own eligibility and also get more money for the State of Illinois. Now if it's the wish of this House that we do away with this type of a working Commission, then so be it. But I ask you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #20 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Jim Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and particularly Representative Campbell, I think the point that is at issue here is not whether the Commission does a good job, but when the Commission does a good job the Members on the Commission are not sitting on the standing Committees which make decisions following up what the recommendations of the Commissions are. And that's true across the board of all the Commissions. We have Commissions gathering information. And yet, that information is not tied into the decision making process. And that has been pointed out time and time again when the Members of this House tried to cut Commissions. We create the Commissions. They gather information. But they aren't the people who then make the decisions in Committee. And what you have then is new people having to relearn that information and it's a....duplication of work and really unnecessary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman



from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "No, I rise on a point of personal privilege because I am a Member of this Commission. And I would just like to point out to the Gentleman that just spoke, that if he looked at the legislative record of the Commission as opposed to the House Committee that hears substantive legislation, he'll find that we are successful more times than we're unsuccessful, while the Committee is unsuccessful more times than it is successful. So I think that, in itself, is a good recommendation to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 64 'ayes', 79 'nays', 1 recorded 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #21, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, another Commission that I have a lot of sympathy for in their expertise.... certainly they have operated admirably in the past. My question is not to them concerning whether or not they are successful in legislative activities. My question to them is why do they need to expend 65 thousand hard earned dollars of our taxpayers of Illinois to study the problems of our schools. Now, let's be very frank and honest. I don't know who all the Members are on the School Problems Commission. But let's exclude all the Members of the Legislature and let's exclude all the members of the public schools organizations around this state and who have you got left? Now to expend 65 thousand dollars for almost a total Commission of public employees, already at the public trust, I would suggest.....that it's almost a silly kind of expenditure of money. When you look at the lists of the membership, you start out with Senator..... Representative Hoffman, Senator Berman, Doctor D'Amico,



Doctor Ben Hubbard, Mildred Kitell. And then you have Senators Berman, Davidson, Glass, Guidice and Hall. Brady, Hoffman, McClain, Polk and Schneider from the House. And then appointed by the Governor, Doctor Walter Bishop, Domico, Harris Fawell, Mike Finkle and Curtis Plott, Superintendent of Education, Joseph Cronin and the Director of the Budget, Robert Mandeville. Now I suggest to you Members of the General Assembly that if you could find somebody that's in need of a meal on this Committee and Commission.....outside of Mike McClain, I would say that this would be a wise expenditure of taxpayers' money. But you and I know that the Committees on elementary and secondary education could better use these funds in behalf of the taxpayers than to have public members sitting around deliberating.....suggesting what this House and Senate should do in the way of the school problem. I just feel it's a waste of money. If they want to serve, they should, but without the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. And I move to adopt Amendment #21 to House Bill 3069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not going to take a great deal of time to point out to you why the School Problems Commission serves a significant purpose. It is in fact, the oldest existing Commission. And with two exceptions, all of the Legislative Members of the Commission are Members of the appropriate Committees in either the House or the Senate. You've all received a number of communique recently in regard to the Senate Bills conforming legislation to 94-142, Education Of All The Handicapped Persons Act which now reside on Third Reading. These Bills and this program was started by the Commission back in August of 76. If you want to look at the expenditure list for Commissions you will find for a productive Commission like the School Problems



Commission, 65 thousand dollars puts us into the small peanuts category. We do not spend a great deal of money, we never have. And for that reason, as well as others I have mentioned, I would appreciate a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #21 be adopted? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 53 'ayes', 73 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment loses. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #22, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting Section 7."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Commission. Once again, I have no objections with its aims.....objectives and certainly it could prove itself as a necessary operation in order to advise us on nutrition. But to expend once again 125 thousand dollars by a group of citizens and Members of the General Assembly to introduce legislation on nutrition and coordinate the local and the state and the federal feeding programs for pre-school children and the elderly and the pregnant women and others, I suggest could be better spent by various Commissions.....or Committees of the House and Senate. I have no objection with its intent....it wants to operate, fine. It's just that I think that there are other areas that we could spend the money on. And I move for adoption of Amendment #22 on House Bill 3069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Rigney: "Mr. Hanahan, is this the outfit that met in Chicago one time this winter and served fish and I don't know.... imported dandelion greens or something and got all that big publicity in there, is that the same outfit?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "No, that was a union meeting."

150.

Hanahan: "Representative Rigney,

I'd defer to Representative Peters who I understand is a Member of the Commission. I didn't know you liked dandelions and things like that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, that was just a front that we put on.

Actually, what we had was beef which was slaughtered in Representative Rigney's district and....bought from a provider in his district and we put it in a little polish sausage...and we helped a lot of people, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "It's going to be difficult for me to support this. I think probably the concept is very good and I'm sure that many in an agricultural community realize that we're going to have to do things to improve the American diet. The only thing I suggest is next time when you meet, I hope you're going to service big macs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the idea of these Amendments is to catch the Legislature up with the 1970 Constitution. Before that, we used to adjourn sine die every June 30th on even....on odd numbered years and the Legislature would be out of Session for 18 months. The only way that the Legislature could continue in existence or Legislators could do any work is to create Commissions by statute that would have a life beyond the life of the Legislature. While in the 1970 Constitution it made the Legislature a perpetual Body which makes our Committees perpetual Bodies and allows them to work. And the only way that we're going to be able to have the Committees work efficiently and give them the resources that they can use to work is to eliminate the duplication of services between Commissions and Committees. Let's put our resources where they count. Let's not have a dual system. And I'd urge the adoption of these Amendments."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #22 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Laurino. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 62 'ayes', 74 'nays'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #23, Hanahan, amends Senate Bill (sic) 3069 by Amendment....deleting Section 8."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this seems to be an awful silly Commission. I....I don't know when we're going to adopt one of these Amendments, but I'd suggest that this is one maybe we ought to start at. This is the 911 Commission on the Emergency Telephone Study Commission. Now to expend 25 thousand dollars, Ladies and Gentlemen, on a Commission that is made up of either public Members of the General Assembly or fat cat bureaucrats of a public utility whose rates are set and subjected by a Commerce Commission who are employed at high level salaries so that you could have your phone bills as high as they are and for those people to sit around and have dinners and meetings at plush hotels and to expend 25 thousand dollars to study what the hell is going to happen when we get 911 in Illinois is almost ludicrous. If you want to spend this 25 thousand, go ahead. But I say to you, I haven't heard a word of defense on why we should expend 25 thousand dollars when we have a Utilities Committee of this House and of the Senate that can sit around and in fifteen minutes and tell you more about the impact of 911 than anything else. So I say, if you want to start saving some taxpayer's dollars and putting it in the Education Fund, here's a chance to save 25 thousand dollars. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #23 to House Bill 3069."

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



Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what the status of this Amendment is, but the Commission hasn't even been created yet. So, actually if you had voted for our.... Katz and my Bill to fund the 911 program, you wouldn't even have to have the Commission. But it just seems to me that nobody at this point was....wanted to take the step of funding the Commission, which is a mandated program and everybody suggested that we come up with some reasons as to exactly why the program was supposed to be in operation and where the money was going to come from. And that's the reason for the Commission, the report back next year. It's not going to last, it's going to be a one time shot. I voted for all of your Amendments so far and I'll vote for this one. But I think we should be treated likewise on all of them."

Hanahan: "If that was a question, Sir....I'd like to point out I'm not picking on this Commission any more than any other. And I'm aware that you haven't started to spend money and I'm for your Commission. I'm just not for funding it with taxpayers' dollars when only those who are either working for a public utility or Members of the General Assembly would receive any of the rights to expend the money. So I would suggest, even though I'm for somebody to study it, I think the Committee on Public Utilities of this House probably would be the proper area that should be appealed to....to provide the expertise to function on the study of the use of 911."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #23 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, may I have some attention, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, would you kindly give the Gentleman some attention? Please, proceed, Sir."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank my colleague from McHenry for this tour de force that he has shown us



today. Those dulcet tones, I'll miss them, Tommy, I really will. You're mellifluous, no kidding. But, seriously, why don't you take this out of the record until the Sponsor can at least have an opportunity to come over and answer your comments? Especially when you call them a....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's interesting to see that this Commission is one that we're going to do away with. There's no public Members to have any ties with other Members to.....you vote for my Commission, I'll vote for yours. So nobody owes this Commission anything, so.... we can do away with it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it we're not doing away with the Commission, we're simply reducing the budget to zero. I'll be happy along with some of....those of you who want this Commission funded, to offer an Amendment to fund it at the level of 9 hundred and 11 dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 103 'ayes', 39 'nays' and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #24, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "This is special study on energy resources and the request is for 30 thousand dollars. Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, I have no objection with a special study being conducted in this state for energy resources. But I suggest that there is already, at your wisdom, an Energy Resources Commission. And for us to duplicate that Commission, expend another 30 thousand dollars for some



sort of executive director and some sort of travel appropriation when I have already pointed out that we are spending 156 thousand dollars for an identical....you know, program that I'm opposed to, would almost be once again an duplicity of waste and something that all of us should be on guard against on the criticism that could befall us when we expend the taxpayers' money foolishly. I just suggest that if any Member of the General Assembly has an idea that needs to be studied, I would suggest that this study should be made with an existing Committee of the House or the Senate. And if worse, it should be at least conducted through the existing Commission that has already been approved by your vote on this....by the floor of this House on Amendment #3. So I ask for a favorable vote.... Roll Call on doing away with expending 30 thousand dollars of the taxpayer's money that I don't think will ever be properly spent in comparison to what already is being spent with the Energy Resources Commission."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Hanahan has misread the intent of this Amendment. The Illinois Energy Resources Commission would be the entity that would handle this Amendment. But the point is that there are various cities, suburban areas and agricultural groups all over this state that have energy problems that need to be able to apply to the Illinois Energy Resources Commission for small seed monies to make applications to the Department of Energy on the federal level which has a fund for various types of demonstration projects. This Amendment will give to the various cities all over this state the capacity and it will give the Illinois Energy Resources Commission the capacity to receive applications from cities and from agricultural groups and from suburban areas to study their energy needs and do something about it. We have a phenomenon that is existing in this nation



and in this state. We had a close down of industry because there is an inadequate energy supply. And I think it's the various cities and the various agricultural groups and the various suburban areas ought to have and ought to be able to apply to the Illinois Energy Resources Commission for money to prepare their applications so that they can become energy self-sufficient. And I ask for your support of this Amendment because it is a valuable Amendment to the various cities, agricultural groups and suburban areas all over this state. And he has misread the Amendment. He has misinterpreted it and this is very vitally needed. And I ask for a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #24 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Martin: "I would thank Mrs. Younger for her explanation. This should bring lots of green votes. Now we're giving money to Commissions to hand out seed money when we have a Department of Energy already in government. This is the height of mischievousness of our part."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote. The timer's on."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one would have to know the area, for example, from where Representative Younger comes. And this request....this Amendment I think is really not necessary because the need is there for help in those distressed areas. And I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 80 'ayes', 62 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #25, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as



amended by deleting Section 10."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in such intent of House Bill 3069 on the Amendment, there are a group of Commissions that are lumped together, there's six of them that are lumped together, that I am trying to adversely affect their expending of taxpayers' money that I think could be in error. Number one, is the Labor Laws Commission. And they want to expend 20 thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money to study labor laws. Now of all the things that they have done, redone, undone, worked on and unworked is labor laws of this state. Now I'm not picking on them any more than anyone else. But I think the Committee on Labor and Industry of the House and the Senate has by far greater expertise on the needs of reworking labor laws than any Commission that could be put together by the Governor and by the appointment of the Speaker or the President of the Senate. I think to expend 20 thousand dollars on that item is foolish. Now I have to continue on, so I'll hit all six Sections of this one Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me. Excuse me, James. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask whether we can have a division on each of the parts of the Amendment in terms of the vote. And I only ask that because there are individualthere are individuals, Mr. Chairman, who have an interest, evidently, in Commissions but only their own and have voted against everybody else's. And I certainly would like the opportunity to vote 'no' on a couple here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, Why don't we just....I'm sure it will be rectified in the Conference Committee somewhere, Mr. Peters. The Amendment is not divisible. And please proceed in naming the five other Commissions you want to remove,



Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "The second is, the data information system chaired by my colleague and a good friend and I in no way impugn the ability of this Commission or in any way suggest that they haven't done their job or provided us with information and suggested good legislation. But once again, I think there's enough Committees of the House and Senate that could do the job a lot cheaper, with just as great expertise being afforded them...free, instead of paid for by taxpayers of this state for the amount of 75 thousand dollars. In the Spanish Speaking Peoples Study Commission, I could point out that with pride at one time I think that Commission did an admirable job in recommending legislation. They certainly have been in the forefront of the fight of bilingual education and other aspects of needed social change in this state. But if you look through the statutes and you look through the appropriation Bills, there's a least six or seven various appropriations for the Spanish speaking problem areas mixed into the various statutes to concern themselves by administration and by law with the problems of the Spanish speaking people. I suggest that those taxpayer dollars are in excess of a half a million dollars that we are already expending both in the Department of Labor, in Office of Education, the Department of Developmental Disabilities, the Department of Public Aid and the various other organizations that have specific line items in their budgets handling Spanish speaking people's problems. For us to expend 50 thousand dollars of the taxpayer's money to have a group of people discussing the same problems that the public employees that are on our payroll are already discussing, I think it's a duplicity and a waste of the taxpayer's dollars. Another expenditure, by one of my tennis opponents, that has asked for 35 thousand dollars to do a study on the Mirage task force. For those of us that have read the Sun Times



and the investigation that took place on the Mirage episode up on North Park Street in Chicago. I don't think we need to spend 35 thousand dollars in a Commission expenditure to study the problems that had been uncovered by this newspaper's enterprising, innovative entrapment. I think that the Department of Law Enforcement probably would be a better area to expend the dollars that would do any good in this area. Urban Education Commission for 10 thousand dollars. Another area, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, of a complete duplication of work that you have decided should continue under Amendment #6, which allowed the Schools Problems Commission 65 thousand dollars. To spend another 10 thousand dollars on Urban Education Commission that nobody could justify and in my mind a need for a continued existence or a need to create....to expend 10 thousand dollars to study urban education, when we have studied it to death, seems to me another duplication and waste of taxpayer's dollars. And then, finally, 200 thousand dollars to revise and rewrite the Public Aid Code. Ladies and Gentlemen, this one really gets me because...I'd point out to you that we have a reference bureau, an Illinois Legislative Reference Bureau, that doesn't do too much from now until we come back next November. Oh....that's another Amendment? A separate Amendment. O.K., then I'm off on these. Now I'll have to gather my thoughts on that last one but....these five that I've spoke on, labor laws, data information, Spanish speaking and the Mirage task force and urban education add up to a good sum of taxpayers' dollars that I think could be better expended through the Committee system of this House, if necessary. And if not necessary, the dollars could be better used in education for the children of this state. And I move to adopt Amendment #25 to House Bill 3069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."



Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too wish that this issue were divisible for several reasons. Number one, I would invite you, if you think you know anything about data information and computers, to give me your name and we'll try and see if you can't be put on the Commission because when this Commission operates it is a Commission of experts. If you take a look at the vouchers that have been submitted, you will find that within the State of Illinois most of the people that have the obligation to run those Sections are on the Commission because you put them there last time and those expenses are not paid by the Commission. You're talking about a Commission that now reviews the largest expenditure in equipment in the State of Illinois. I would suggest to you that it is.....it's gotta be a labor of love because it's a lot of hard work for nothing. And if you want a lot more work for nothing in return, I suggest that you give me your name. We'll try to get you on. So I would say to you, just in defense of the Commission alone, the fact that we have had great work as both sides I think in the support of people can tell you, plus the fact that we have an obligation that's just endless and is going to get worse instead of better."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Question of the Sponsor."

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

Johnson: "Representative Hanahan, are there any portions of the 190 thousand dollars appropriated for these different Commissions that might go to things like trips out of state or even intercontinental trips or travel vouchers and those sort of things or is this all just pure, hard core in the state expenditures?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan, please."

Hanahan: "Representative, I have found that serving on a Commission under our statutes of the state pretty



much allow you to do anything you want with that money as far as wasting it. You could spend it for a worthwhile purpose, but you and I know that anyone who has served on a Commission, if they so chose, could absolutely waste the money by going on exotic trips to California or to Washington D.C., to commingle with other people that have spent their time on golf courses and tennis courts and other... or even race tracks if they want. There is nothing that prohibits these Commissions. And that's one of the defects that we have allowed over the years...to have an orderly process of knowing whether or not the expenditure of the taxpayer's dollars are proper. When we give them a line item of personal services and they want to hire an executive director whether or not that person is qualified or not, we, under the statutes, have no control once we have given them the money and created the Commission. So I say to you, yes, they could waste their money in so many ways of travel and expenditure on any kind of willy-nilly silliness that comes to their minds as long as they do it publicly, at a public meeting and authorize the expenditure. That's all they have to comply with. But, as you know, they sorta hide it."

Speaker Lecowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #25 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Let's get moving. This only eliminates six Commissions. Labor Laws Commission is one. The Chair stands corrected. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I'd like to tell the Members of the General Assembly that although they're voting with Hanahan, that doesn't mean you lose your flagpole that hold up the four flags from the AFLCIO."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 63 'ayes', 78 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. Kindly record Mr.



Robinson as 'aye'. The Amendment fails. May I point out to the House that there are 98 Amendments filed on this Bill as of now. Amendment #26."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #26, Hanahan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting Section 1.1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is on the revise and rewriting of the Public Aid Code, 200 thousand dollars. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to point something out here. We fund an operation called the Illinois Legislative Reference Bureau. We fund that organization to operate almost exclusively with lawyers and high paid technicians that operate the reference bureau in our behalf of the House and Senate. We have an Illinois Legislative Council. A very highly organized, a very good organization servicing this General Assembly that operates full time. When we're back in our districts, operating as Legislators....not because the only time we operate as Legislators is down here, the press fails to take note of that sometimes, we're Legislators back in that district. But while we're back in our home district, a reference bureau and a Legislative Council is operating. And for us now to be asked to expend 200 thousand dollars to rewrite and revise the Public Aid Code seems to me an awful waste of hard earned taxpayer's dollars. We could set the Legislative Council....to revise and rewrite, we have the reference bureau with all those lawyers, some of them not paid adequately and some of them over paid, to sit down and rewrite that Public Aid Code. But to hire outside consultants and to put a few contractual service dollars to work is an awful waste and a duplicity of waste for the taxpayers of Illinois to stomach. I suggest very strongly that we adopt this Amendment so that we save 200 thousand dollars. And if we need to spend it, we spend it with our people that work for the reference



bureau and the Illinois Council. I move to adopt Amendment #26 to House Bill 3069."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."
Houlihan: "I'll defer, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #26 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 56 'ayes', 81 'nays'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #27, Mrs. Younge, amends House Bill 3069 as amended....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Take it out of the record...the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady wants to take the Bill out of the record."

Younge: "Just table the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me?"

Younge: "Table the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady wants to withdraw Amendment #27. The Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #28, Lucco, amends House Bill 3069 as amended in Section 3 and so forth. Representative Lucco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask permission to table this Amendment at this time....or withdraw the Amendment rather."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #28. Hearing no objection, the Amendment is withdrawn. Amendment #29."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #29, Marovitz, amends House Bill 3069 as amended....."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and



Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #29 appropriates 1 million, 585 thousand dollars, . . . 245 thousand dollars for the Mental Health Bills, the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission which encompass the Office of State Guardian, the Human Rights Authority and the Legal Advocacy Service. And I would ask for adoption of Amendment #29."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I arise to oppose this Amendment, which is an appropriation of 1.6 million dollars. It's an appropriation, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to fund the new, the brand new state agency that would be created by the passage of Senate Bill 253 which is at the Order of Third Reading and which we haven't acted upon. This new state agency, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by the very terms of the Bill would be independent from any governmental agency within this state. And I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one of the governmental agencies in this state is the Office of the Auditor General required by the Constitution for the auditing of public funds. We would be appropriating over one and a half million dollars for a brand new state agency, free from auditing by the Auditor General. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have a Bill for an agency which by its terms would not be expressly subject to the personnel code. Going on, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we would be funding a new . . . brand new state agency not only free and independent from any other state agency, but a brand new state agency which would have the authority, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to establish regulations to which all other state agencies would be required to respond within 60 days. Going on, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we would be funding a state agency, a brand new state agency which over the years would become



the largest law firm, public or private, in the State of Illinois if not in the United States of America. A state agency which its principle function would be to provide free legal services to recipients. Going on, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we would be giving to this state agency powers that some of us are fearful will take place in 1984. And I refer to you, Section 17 of Senate Bill 253, which says in the course of an investigation, a regional board of this agency may enter, physically enter and inspect the premises of a service provider or state agency and question privately any person therein within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner. That is 1984, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Going on, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me, Mr. Schlickman. I believe that we're discussing Amendment #29....."

Schlickman: "And, Mr. Speaker, this Amendment appropriates money for the activity of a state agency to be created by 253. We can't, Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That issue is not being discussed at this time.

Schlickman: ".....confine ourselves to money without considering the end and object of that money. Going on, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House....."

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

Marovitz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Gentleman is discussing the merits of the legislation and not, in fact, the appropriation which is not the legislation before us. And I would ask that the Gentleman be instructed to confine himself to this particular Amendment #29."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #29 be adopted? All Those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we would be funding an agency which in Section 35 says....."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Sir, you're not addressing yourself to the Amendment. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. I want 'aye' on that."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I know that we're on explanation of vote, but Mr. Schlickman did raise what I consider to be...two legitimate questions. He suggested that this agency would not be subject to audit by the Auditor General. And he suggested that the employees of the Commission would not be subject to the personnel code. My remembrance of an Amendment offered to one of those Bills was that the Amendment provided that the employees would become subject to the personnel code. But in any event, I think that there ought to be some discussion on those two objections."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook...pardon me. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "If we can't discuss the merits of the Bill then let me discuss the merits of the Amendment. A 1.6 million dollar blank check to an agency we have not considered on this floor is too much. Is that relevant enough, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry we've got into the merits of the Bill because that's not what's here. This is a good Bill and we will get into the merits. But we need this money to establish the agency. And if by some chance the....Bill 253 is not passed, then this can be cut out by the Governor. But we've got to have the money. And I urge some green votes up there."

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

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'aye' on this Amendment. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm disturbed by your ruling on Representative Schlickman. The effect of your ruling is to say to me that when the appropriation for the Department of Children and Family Services comes up, I cannot discuss within the confines of that appropriation the merits of



that Department. And I find that very disturbing, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is an appropriation for an agency whether or not that agency exists or not. And Mr. Schlickman, it seem to me, has a right to discuss the merits of an agency which an Amendment or a Bill is funding. I find your ruling very disturbing, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Madison, I believe he was talking about the merits of another Bill and not the agency. And according to the Constitution....according to the....you have to have substantive legislation and then the appropriation. And in fact, the department that you mentioned, is already covered by statute and has been created. Mr. Schlickman, Children and Family Services is created, Sir. I'm well aware of that. I am addressing Mr. Madison's point....and that point alone, Sir. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it just seems to me that if we were ever buying a pig in a poke, this is it. We're voting on over a million and a half dollars for an agency that, by statute as I understand it hasn't even been voted on or created yet. And nobody knows what the money is going for. And if we can't ask questions on how this money is going to be spent and for what purpose, I think on that....that should be reason enough in itself for the Members to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Leinenweber, from Will. Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, I'd like to explain my vote too. Again, this appropriation is for an agency of government which does not exist. It's the Human Rights Authority Commission....and...or the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission....it's the...when you get substance of the Bill you'll even find out that it's quite...probably unconstitutional. I certainly urge 'no' votes. And I certainly join with the Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Schlickman in suggesting that if the 'noes' exceed...or the 'ayes' exceed the 'noes', that we have a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to explain his vote."

Marovitz: "I'd just like to point out that the Bill and the Commission and the Members of that Commission are very definitely subject to the personnel code. That is specifically set out in the Bill. Furthermore, the Members of this Commission are not independent of state government but in fact, due to an Amendment which we adopted yesterday, all are to be appointed by the Governor of the State of Illinois. And I'd like to point those two things out, which are in contradiction with my friend from the other side of the aisle. This is a very, very important appropriation for three agencies which are perhaps the most important agencies regarding the entire mental health field of any agencies in the State of Illinois. And I would certainly ask people to consider and to vote green on this important appropriation."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to Representative Leinenweber's point. I think what he overlooks is that we do have an advocacy service for developmentally disabled. And what this...the Bill would do...that this would appropriate money for would be to extend that to other individuals who have mental diseases and who are subject to treatment by the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. I think it's important to keep in mind that these are precisely the people who are unable to care for themselves and who are unable to plead their own case and unable to hire their own attorneys privately. So it seems to me that the Gentleman was misinformed and that we ought to put the green votes on the board for the.... for Representative Marovitz. I see Representative Pullen is voting against this one. I'm very sad to see that."



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

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

The Majority Leader and the Sponsor of this Amendment have questioned my veracity. I stated that there is nothing in this Bill that expressly provides that the employees of this Commission will be subject to the personnel code. I have the Bill here. Would you please site the page, the Section and the line number which states expressly that they will be subject to the personnel code? Also, with respect to the matter of the independency of the state agency. I call to your attention Section 3, on page 2 of Senate Bill 253 which says the Commission....Section 3the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission is hereby created as an agency of state government. The Commission shall be independent from any other governmental agency. Would you please cite to me the Amendment which we adopted that modifies that provision?"

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives and Mr. Schlickman. Gene, I did not question your statements. I simply commented that although we were on explanation of vote, that I thought the points raised by you ought to be answered. But I'm not in a position to answer the questions. I'm not a Sponsor of this Bill." But I think you included me in your....in the beginning of your personal privilege."

Schlickman: "Mike, I apologize."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You accept his apology, Mr. Madigan? He accepts your apology, Mr. Schlickman. Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Prior to answering the question, I'd like to clarify for my friend on the other side of the aisle that because two individuals disagree on a particular point that doesn't mean that one is questioning that individual's veracity. I certainly did not question your veracity. If you check the transcripts you'll see that, Gene. I may disagree with



you about whether the Members are covered by the personnel code.

And I would point out that one Page 4, line 1 it says specifically that they are covered by the personnel code."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer. Excuse me. Still on a point of personal privilege for Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "The Gentleman is absolutely correct and I apologize. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 'ayes'....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Meyer: "Vote me 'no' please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. Meyer from 'aye' to 'no'. On this question there are 84 'ayes', 84 'nays'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Madison as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz. Kindly record him as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Request a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks....poll the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees. Jack, will you kindly poll the absentees? O.K., fine."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, Ebbesen, Harris, Kornowicz, Schoeberlein, no further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Jack? Excuse me. Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Johnson: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change him to 'no'. The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen. Kindly record Mr. Christensen as 'aye'. What's the count, Jack? On this



question there are 86 'ayes', 85 'noes'. And the Gentleman asked for a verification. Mr. Schlickman asked for a verification."

Mr. Schlickman: "And I respectfully request, Mr. Speaker, that the Members be in their seats and raise their hands when their names are called."

Speaker Lechowicz: "86 to 85. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that I have some reservations about this, if I can possibly avoid a verification change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record....Jack, did you hear that? Mr. Tipsword to 'aye'. Kindly record Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Mr. Porter, for what.....as 'aye'. Mr. Monroe Flinn as 'aye'. Mr. R. Walsh as 'aye'. Are you writing all those down? R. Walsh....have you got him? Mr. Sharp as 'aye'. Mr. Jacobs as 'aye'. Anyone else? What's our count now? Now the count is 90 'ayes', 81 'noes'. Mr. Margalus."

Margalus: "I'd like to change mine from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Magalus as 'aye'. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I withdraw my request for a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. And Amendment #29 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #30, E.M. Barnes, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof an act making certain appropriations and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #30 is an Amendment which does various things. This Amendment incorporates into a single Bill



seven individual-fiscal '79 operation contingency expense requests and recommends certain operational reduction. The agencies, their original requests and the recommended change, the subsequent new totals and the percentage of change are as follows in a summary. These recommendations, with the exception of the Racing Board, affects only general revenue dollars and impacts only on requested increases in the personal service line. The recommendation does not, does not affect grant in aid items, income assistant payments or items such as foster care payments and payments to private providers. They are listed as follows: DCFS, Department of Children and Family Services....the change would be minus 1 million, 435 thousand, 990....or 1.2% change. The Department of Law Enforcement would be 158 thousand....158 thousand, 700 for a net change of 0.2%. The Liquor Control, Mental Health, Military and Naval minus 121 thousand or a net change of 2.9%....Public Health minus 1 million, 341 thousand, 1 hundred....1.6% change. The Racing Board minus 27 thousand, 500 or a net change of 0.3%. The overall total request, 713 million, 641 thousand."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McClain, what is your point?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. According to rule 53-7, one officer or employee of a state agency requested by a Member to be present on that day to assist in the presentation legislation pending before the House may be on the House floor. Now right now we are discussing very important Amendment and there are liaisons for each state agency running around to the Membership saying this thing does this for your district, this thing does this, this thing does that. I'd ask you to enforce that ruling. They should not be on the floor. There is no need for them to be here for the presentation of that piece of legislation. And I'd ask you to enforce that rule and get them off the floor."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Will all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the Chamber? Will the Doorkeepers kindly enforce the rules of the House? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, please continue on with your explanation of Amendment #30."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The original request of the above mentioned agencies with 713 million, 643 thousand. The recommended request is 710 million, 557 thousand, 910 for a net reduction of 3 million, 84 thousand, 290 or 0.4%. These recommendations for each agency is detailed and the Amendment that you have before you and at this point, Mr. Speaker, to facilitate time, I would answer any questions relative to Amendment #30."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to question the germaneness of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Amendment is germane. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will, Ma'am."

Geo-Karis: "Under the Department of Children and Family Services budget....this is the one I'm addressing my query, are we cutting out approximately a half a million dollars on the Child Abuse Program?"

Barnes: "No."

Geo-Karis: "What are you cutting out then?"

Barnes: "The only reduction in this Amendment as it relates to Children and Family Services is in the area offices."

Geo-Karis: "Aren't the area offices the ones that are looking into the child abuse problems and God knows we have so many of them in Illinois?"

Barnes: "We have eliminated....this Amendment does not address itself to direct care positions as I indicated earlier. These are only administrative....administrative type and clerical positions that's eliminated in this Amendment."



Geo-Karis: "Would these positions be the type of positions that would investigate child abuse cases?"

Barnes: "No."

Geo-Karis: "Would you name the positions that are involved?"

Barnes: "Which positions are you interested in, Representative? I'd be happy to do so, but there are many, many positions. Could you direct your question....Representative, if you'd direct your question to me specifically, I'd be more than happy to answer it. But there are many....many positions so I can't go in to it generally."

Geo-Karis: "Well, what I'm driving at, Representative, is this. I'm very, very concerned that these positions, although they are administrative in nature, they might be the type of administrative positions that are concerned with receiving child abuse complaints, processing them and following them through. Because you know and I know and you and I have worked on child abuse matters and child abuse legislation, that this is one of the key things we have to look into for our young people because there's just been too darn many cases of them. And we have not done the job we should have done and I'm afraid that if we go along with the appropriation cut that you suggest...in that I'm afraid that it might affect the very element that we know as horrible child abuse."

Barnes: "Well, Representative, that is not the case because what we have done, as I indicated to you, no direct services workers are involved here. Every one of the social workers that are involved in that agency has been eliminated from this Amendment. Not only that, but to go further, the administration of this department has had a hiring freeze in this area and many of the workers that you are concerning yourself with are not even there. Those are positions that the department has held vacant themselves. But beyond that, beyond that, we, to insure that nothing would in any way draw any effort



for the department to function...we did not include them in any reduction in this Amendment."

Geo-Karis: "All right, now when you say that these positions have been held vacant, is it possible that....suppose we pass a budget like this one let's say and then pass it by July, yet the money for it does not come until October, isn't that so?"

Barnes: "What was the question? I didn't....we appropriate money July 1st, the money comes July 1st."

Geo-Karis: "We appropriate it July 1st...but when do they get it?"

Barnes: "As I understand the appropriation process, the money is available upon the signature of the Governor. I would assume that if it was passed by July 1st, he will sign them."

Geo-Karis: "Is it possible that some of these vacancies may have taken place because of the difference between the times...."

Barnes: "The vacancies that have taken place in this agency, according to the information presented to the Appropriation Committee, because of a hiring freeze instituted by the Governor."

Geo-Karis: "You're saying that what you're doing is cutting out these positions to....."

Barnes: "No, no, no. We are leave those positions in. As a matter of fact, Representative.....now Representative, if you don't talk to the liaison person....matter of fact, not only are we leaving those positions in but we have another Amendment down the line that will add more workers in this very area that you are questioning me about. Because we feel the importance of that area and we will add additional money for that purpose."

Geo-Karis: "Would I be correct in saying....this....I'd have to check the staff aide, would I be correct in saying that the information you got about the personnel on hand is as of December 1977?"



Barnes: "We monitor head count every month. Every month by computer, we got them by computer, by pay period. We monitor them every pay period. So these are up to date accurate figures. Now the agency don't want to give them to you that way. They give them to you at their leisure. The last one that they submitted was as of December 31. But we go to the payroll where they pay their people and we get them every pay period."

Geo-Karis: "So then you are current are you not, Representative, in the information on the payrolls as let's say up to...."

Barnes: "We have the current information as of.....as available to their vacancies as of when this Amendment was drafted."

Geo-Karis: "And when was that drafted, Sir?"

Barnes: "About two days ago."

Geo-Karis: "So then you are pretty current, is that right?"

Barnes: "That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

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

Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Jaffe: "Gene, I have some stuff here that was given to me by DCFS to the department and I want to question....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. We can't hear you. Do you want to repeat your question?"

Jaffe: "I have some questions here about certain sections of the DCFS budget. Now if we come to Community Services for Visually Handicapped, they indicate that you are cutting out 23 thousand, 8 hundred dollars which would be a staff of two rehabilitation teachers. Is that correct, Gene?"

Barnes: "Those positions that you are interested in, Representative, is not in this Amendment. We do not cut those positions out, we eliminated them. We do not reduce them. They are still in the budget."

Jaffe: "Then you're saying that the services to the visually impaired patient in a nursing home would then continue,



is that correct?"

Barnes: "I would hope it would continue. But as you know the department has took it upon themselves, even though we appropriate the money, not to make that service available. But with this Amendment those....that capability is still there because we are still appropriating the money for those services."

Jaffe: "O.K. because if you remember under the Thompson administration they did cut those services out all together. And we went before your Committee and your Committee then gave us money to hire the rehabilitation teachers for the visually impaired in nursing homes which was cut out completely. Now you're telling me that that money will be in there to continue the visually impaired patients in nursing homes."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Jaffe: "O.K. let's jump down to the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired. The stuff that they give me indicates that your budget will take out 42 thousand, 880 dollars which would mean a reduction in staff of four, one social worker, one support service worker, one business administrator and one braille printer. Now if there's ever a place that really needs money, I think it's the Illinois School for the Visually Impaired. Are the figures that he gives me correct?"

Barnes: "As I understand, Representative...I was trying to follow you over the roar, but in the area that you have questioned, we did remove one support service worker. But the other child care worker that is listed there, the other has not been removed."

Jaffe: "Well, actually they give me something that indicates that they have four staff people missing. Would that be correct or incorrect?"

Barnes: "Four staff people?"

Jaffe: "Yes, from the Illinois School for Visually Impaired."



They say it would result in a loss of one social worker, one braille printer and one business administrator, one

Barnes: "No Sir, no social worker has been reduced by this Amendment. Whoever has given you the information that you have has given you faulty information."

Jaffe: "That's why I'm asking the questions, Representative Barnes. The Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute, they indicate that that would be a reduction in the staff of five which would be two educators, one storekeeper and two support service workers...which would be a reduction of 47 thousand dollars. Is that correct or incorrect?"

Barnes: "The only ones, Representative, the only positions that we have eliminated in that area is one storekeeper..... one storekeeper and.....one clerk steno, let me get it correctly and three educators. And the reason for eliminating those positions is that the agency....the agency has held them vacant more than a half a year. So those positions have not been filled in the current year. There was no indication from the agency that they would be filled."

Jaffe: "Let me just ask one question and then I'll address myself to that portion of it. The Illinois School for the Deaf.....they indicate there that there would be a reduction of 37...3 for four staff workers, one psychologist, one social worker, one support service worker and one account technician. Is that correct or incorrect? All I know is that they have given me these figures just a few minutes ago and this is the first opportunity I've really had to ask you about them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners....."

Barnes: "Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. As he asks the questions I have to turn the pages so I hope you would bear with me. Each one of the positions that you have asked us



about in this budget as it relates to the Illinois Children's Hospital.....School for the Deaf are newly requested positions that was not filled....have not been filled since as far back as September of last year. None of them have been filled. This agency does not indicate at any time that they will be filled but simply request them to carry additional money over as you know the transfer as they so wish."

Jaffe: "Well if I could just address a couple portions of the thing. The only thing that really disturbs me about the DCFS budget as you know is that they really never come in for enough money. And by enlarge I think that the DCFS people have always succumbed to what the Governor wants and they have really shortchanged by ^{and large} enlarge the visually handicapped, the blind and the deaf people in this particular case. And I think that just because they may not have filled the.....a spot or because certain spots are open, I certainly don't think that that's really good enough for taking that money away. We had a bipartisan Committee which went down to the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute. They are really terribly short on educators. They need those educators and unfortunately, as you have indicated, the Thompson administration put a freeze on hiring new educators and those blind people were really serverely hurt by the actions of the Thompson administration. I would hate to see a Democratic Appropriation Committee really make that a fact and take away 47 thousand dollars and take away three educators when I think the Democratic Party really should be putting educators into the DCFS budget and not taking them out. I also think the same thing is true when it comes to the Illinois School for the Deaf. Deaf people, blind people have been terribly neglected in the Thompson administration and I don't think that we, as Democrats, should be responsible for taking those posistions out of



the budget. If anything we should be putting them in, putting more money in and if the Governor wants, to make him mandatorily veto it. And those are the objections that I would have to the DCFS budget."

Barnes: "Well, Representative, I'm glad you raised the question because.....if you follow along and I know you will, you will find the one thing that you and I have been working for....that you will find with the inclusive Amendments that I am involved with here. We will be putting in better than....better than....and including....I will divide them. We will be putting in for direct service support....better than 3 million dollars in various areas of the budget that the Governor has not requested and would not fund. In addition we will be putting in an additional 10 million dollars for day care which he would never fund at any time. And you will find overall an addition we will add to the DCFS portion of this Amendment will come to....somewhere in the neighborhood of 13 million dollars."

Jaffe: "But will that be in the area of the blind and the deaf?"

Barnes: "I'm sorry I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representatives, please give the Gentlemen order. It's hard to hear."

Jaffe: "The point that I'm making is, you know you've indicated that we're cutting those educators out of the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute. Now what Amendment are you talking about when you say we're going to be putting more money in? And will it be specifically for the Illinois Visually Handicapped School? Will it be for the Illinois School for the Deaf? Where is that money? That is the only question that I have. I just....as I say, the Thompson administration, if it should be hung on anything I think it should be hung on the fact that they really have been terrible in the Department of Children and Family Services. They've cut abuse workers, they've cut



the blind workers. They've cut the deaf workers. And I just don't want to see us as Democrats really taking that Thompson position in cutting out those people when in fact, we should be putting them in. So my question to you is, are we going to put in workers for the blind and for the deaf and for abuse?"

Barnes: "Representative, we aren't taking.....number one, we aren't taking out workers specifically from the blind and the deaf and other areas. In the areas of child abuse we've got to put back in a million point two which the Governor felt that it wasn't necessary to be in this budget. We're going to put back in status offenders a million point one. Which again, the Governor decided that he didn't feel it should be in this budget. We're going to put back in the area of day care as I indicated to you somewhere about 10.4 million dollars. We're going to put back in the area of evaluation for institutional care 132 thousand dollars. So the reductions that we're talking about in addition to that there's another Amendment of local day care area which I have not really discussed here which is another 18 million. But those are the areas that we will be putting funds back into. But I want to make it abundantly clear here that there is no way....that there is any indication that we are cutting back on any services from the appropriations process in DCFS. But what I'm saying to you, Representative, is that many of the positions that you questioned, that the Governor has held vacant for almost a year are positions that we have reduced, areas that we have reduced in. But we have not even reduced those in total. We've simply reduced areas from excess and those areas that have not been filled since last September."

Jaffe: "But if I could just ask you one question with a yes or no answer. You indicated to me that they are cutting three educators out of the Illinois Visually Handicapped



Institute. You've indicated that they're cutting a certain number of educators out of the Illinois School for the Deaf. Will those be replaced?"

Barnes: "Representative, as I indicated to you before, we are cutting out no people out of those places. We are cutting out vacant positions that they have not hired... that was appropriated in the current fiscal year that the department has held vacant. There was no educators there in the first place. The positions were, is and is now vacant."

Jaffe: "But Gene, as I indicated, you know we went down there to the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute. The Thompson administration went and put a freeze on those particular positions, even though they had money for them. They used it for other things. Now the point that I'm making to you is that I think that we ought not cut out positions just because they didn't fill them because I think they need them and they really need them badly. At the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institutethey just don't have....they do not have teachers in many areas. And if we cut out three educators, I think it's just absolutely devastating for the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute. So also...disasterous for the Illinois School for the Deaf."

Barnes: "In answer to your question, Representative, is according to the department and I give you the department'sfigures, I have them here and I'm willing to submit them to you. The department never fills any of these positions. Nor does the department intend to fill any of these positions. They have been held open. They've been held vacant. That money has been used, if it has been used, for some other reason that the department so desired. They are not....these are not filled positions. They never have been."

Jaffe: "Well I....."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe, will you please bring your question to a close?"

Jaffe: "I don't think there's any sense in really going on with it except just to say that when you have three educators that are being cut out of the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute, I think that that is disasterous. The fact that the Thompson administration has not filled them I think is equally disasterous....more disasterous. But I don't just think that we ought to be part and parcel of getting into bed with Thompson to let him cut out educators from the Illinois Visually Handicapped Institute. I have no further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason I seek recognition is that before we get too far into this enlightening debate, I'd just like to request that there be a Roll Call taken on it instead of a voice vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I know that there has been a number of requests of Representative Hart that there be a Democratic Conference but I don't see him on the floor. I wonder if it's your intention of having a meeting shortly tonightsoon, prior to this, after this."

Speaker Redmond: "I have been advised that Representative Hart, Chairman of the Democratic Caucus, was going to call it."

Houlihan: "That's why I asked you. I don't see him here and I wondered....."

Speaker Redmond: "I couldn't answer that. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "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', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Very, very briefly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the



House. I simply want to reiterate again that these reductions are only general revenue dollars that impact only, only on new requested positions...only. The recommendations does not affect any grant-in-aid any income assistance payment or any other direct services position in any agency. I underline that. That's what is here in this Amendment. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit your support for Amendment #30."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is....the question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #30 to House Bill 3069. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there was a time when I was in support of a procedure to bring out omnibus Bill in order to make sure that we were progressing with the appropriations process. However, I find now that my desk is cluttered with so many Amendments to the Bill and still I cannot find half of the Amendments to the Bill that come after this one. I think that we are going to be in chaos if we try to put all of these departments in one Bill and continue to duplicate the kind of discussion, the kind of votes that we have taken hours and hours and hours of Appropriation Committee time to try to decide in an orderly fashion. There is really nothing in this Amendment that I object to specifically. But at this point, I do not feel that it's a wise move on the part of this Body to continue with an omnibus Bill approach for the appropriation process. And therefore, I'm reluctantly voting 'no' and suggesting to our leadership that we discharge the various Bills that have been handled in Committee, assume that the Amendments that were adopted in Committee are a part of those Bills from here forward as we do in the regular Committee process. I think it will save us much time in the long run. I think we will be better able to judge what we have done in Appropriation Committees



for all of these days passed. And in conclusion, I vote 'no' and hope that we can continue in the way I've suggested."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Madison. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'aye' and 103 'no' and the Gentleman's motion failed. The Amendment is not adopted. Any further? It had been planned..... I had better tell you what the plans are for the evening. I was of the opinion that we might have been able to finish earlier tonight and it appears now that we will. So the plan is to continue with House Bills, Second Reading until we finish them, come in tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock and leave about 3 o'clock and come in Sunday at about 3 o'clock. That's customary since I've been here, every weekend we have always been here on the last weekend. Representative James Houlihan. James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, let me point out that Representative William Kempiners, who asked for verification or a specific Roll Call, is going to married on July 5th. So all the Members ought to be here on Saturday and Sunday so we don't go over to July 1st and allow Bill to have a happy honeymoon and not have to come back."

Speaker Redmond: "I have a request from the future bride that I won't divulge for awhile. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #31, E.M. Barnes, amends House Bill 3069 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to at this time withdraw Amendment #31, 32, 33 and 34."

Speaker Redmond: "They're withdrawn. How about 35? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #35, J.M. Houlihan, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by inserting....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."



Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I think maybe you ought to have the Parliamentary look at this Amendment. I believe it might be out of order in that the Amendment just previous was not adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "You can withdraw it if you want to and then we don't have to worry about it?"

Houlihan: "No, I was asking if the Parliamentary would look at it and see if it is out of order. I'm not sure it is or is not." Mr. Speaker, this is out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you mean out of order in sequence or... chronological order?"

Houlihan: "No, it amends the Bill assuming the previous Amendment was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "You want it withdrawn?"

Houlihan: "I'd like to withdraw it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Number 35 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #36, E.M. Barnes, amends House Bill 3069 as amended in Sections 16.03 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to facilitate time here, if the Members whose names I will call at this point.....Representative Bowman, Representative Chapman, Representative Birchler, Representative J.M. Houlihan, Representative Brummer, Representative Van Duyne, Representative McClain does not object, I would like to at this time, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, withdraw every Amendment from Amendment #36 to Amendment #72 because they are all technically incorrect since Amendment #30 was not adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any of the Members.....Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, could you give me a minute to look at that list."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Ryan: "Could you give me one second to look at that.....what



were those numbers again?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments 36 through Amendment #71."

Barnes: "Seventy-two."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, is that all right? Your second is up. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "And I made up my mind and gave you the answer, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "O.K. That was in a split second. Now none of the Members whose names were called off object to withdrawing, is that correct? Amendments 36 through 72 will be withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #73, McClain, amends House Bill 3069 as amended by deleting Section 21.03 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Number 73. Who is the Sponsor of 73? Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw Amendment #73."

Speaker Redmond: "Seventy-three withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #74, E.M. Barnes, amends House Bill 3069 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? E.M. Barnes on 74. Representative Giorgi, Representative Laurino please sit down."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, go back home."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Barnes: "I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #74."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes withdraws Amendment #74."

Barnes: "Number 74, 75, 76 and 77."

Speaker Redmond: "He withdraws 74 through 77. How about 75?"

Barnes: "Number 75 also."

Speaker Redmond: "Number 4,5,6,7. How about 78?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #78, McClain, amends House Bill



3069 as amended in Section....."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 78, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, with leave, I'd like to 78 and 79 at the same time and then withdraw both of them."

Speaker Redmond: "You withdraw 78 and 79, is that correct?"

McClain: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Number 80."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #80, Lucco, amends House Bill 3069 as amended in Section 3."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? Representative Lucco. Representative Robinson?"

Robinson: "Is the Amendment in proper form at this point?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Minority Spokesman has advised me that all the Amendments through 91 are out of order now because of the withdrawal of the previous Amendments. Representative Matijevich.

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, if that's true, then I would ask for leave to table up to that one that you just said is....."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether it's true or not. Representative Lucco is considering 80. Representative Lucco. James Houlihan. Wait a minute, Representative Lucco, on Amendment 80. Representative Byers, please sit down. Representative Byers.

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the Amendment is out of order or not. I am going to present it as though it is properly submitted and in order. The Amendment amends Section 3 in line item for state contributions to state employees retirement system. The Amendment provides for a change in the state contribution to the state employees retirement system on the Illinois Resource Commission. This change is necessary due to an increase in retirement from 7.3% to 7.76%, which was made effective July the 1st. And if the Amendment is improper or out of order, then I would like to know it. Otherwise, I'll present it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."



Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Wasn't Amendment #28 tabled?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Amendment #28 was withdrawn. This is a part of that 28 which became number 80. And as I understand, it is in order."

Mahar: "Well, if 28 was withdrawn and this is part of 28, how could it be in order?"

Lucco: "Because it amends the original Bill, Section 3 and I don't think 28 has anything to do with it. It was withdrawn and never presented. The only thing...I think in question is, is it in chronological or numerical order? I think it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters. Peters. The Parliamentarian advises me that the Amendment is in order. He advises me he's not sure. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, our staff informs us here that they are in agreement with the assessment made by Representative Lucco that it is in order."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #80. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? Representative Geo-Karis. Representative Lucco, are you seeking recognition?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to table Amendment #92."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, when we get there, how about that? Representative Geo-Karis withdraws Amendment 92. Do I hear a.....Representative Peters."

Peters: "Let's take them in order. Mr. Speaker, if we....."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought maybe we'd start a trend."

Peters: "I'll give you 81 and 82 and I'll move to table Amendment 81 and 82, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters withdraws 81. Representative Peters withdraws 82. Wait a minute. You're



withdrawing Representative Houlihan's Bill on 81. Does Representative Houlihan acquiesce in that?"

Peters: "My notes are incorrect then."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, do you want to withdraw your Amendment? Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, before the Gentleman says any more, I apologize. My listing shows it was one of our Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, a little bit red-faced, I'd like to withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan withdraws Amendment 81. How about 82?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Peters, 82."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters withdraws 82. Eighty-three?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Number 83, E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative E.M. Barnes, on Amendment #83. Representative Jaffe, please sit down. McClain, Sharp."

Barnes: "I withdraw Amendment #83."

Speaker Redmond: "Eighty-three is withdrawn...Representative E.M. Barnes. Number 84."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 84, E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I withdraw Amendment #84."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn. Eight-five?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #85, Robinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I withdraw Amendment #85."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn. Eight-six?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #86, Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters....withdraws. Eighty-seven?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #87, Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdraws 88."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #88, Peters."



Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn. Eighty-nine."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #89, Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn. Ninety."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #90, Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #91, Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Ninety-one is withdrawn by Representative Peters. Ninety-two with Representative Geo-Karis is withdrawn. Ninety-three....."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ninety-two is Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Kelly-Geo-Karis."

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly-Geo-Karis? I thought it was Adeline. Ninety-three."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #93, Lynn Martin."

Speaker Redmond: "Ninety-three. Representative Martin withdraws #93."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #94, Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Ninety-four, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Since #30 was not adopted this would not be appropriate. I withdraw this one and I also withdraw #95."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendments #94 and 95 are withdrawn. Any further?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #96, John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Ninety-six, John Dunn. Withdrawn? Withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Number 97, Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 97, Kempiners....withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Number 98, Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been called to the attention....wait a minute, it's been called to the attention of the Chair that the withdrawal of Amendment #13 was in error. Representative Peters. Number 13, did you want to....."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker, with your permission and the indulgence of the House, Amendment #13 was withdrawn by myself in error a lot earlier. But what it ends up doing is it takes the Commission Bills from one of the Bills and puts them all into one package on the other Bill. Representative Matijevecich is aware of this as is Representative Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor of this Amendment mumble that again?"

Peters: (mumbled phrase)

Kane: "What's the total number of dollars involved in this Amendment?"

Peters: "Approximately 2 million."

Kane: "To fund what kind of activities?"

Peters: "Representative Kane, we are not adding anything additional. These are all Commissions that are alreadyhave been passed out of one or the other of the Committees. And what we're doing is taking, by Amendment, the Commissions that have come out of one of the Committees and putting them on the other Bill. Representative Matijevecich is aware of this as of Representative Younge. So what came out of your Committee is now going on Representative Younge's Bill."

Kane: "As I recall what happened in our Committee is that all of those Commissions were a do not pass motion, they were all killed."

Peters: "No, that's something else. These are on the Calendar. These are on 3385. These are the Commissions that are listed here and if you just turn around, Representative Matijevecich will shake his head yes, that's what's happening."

Kane: "Could you name those Commissions?"

Peters: "Yes. These are presently in House Bill 3385, which are on our Calendar and what this Amendment is doing is"



Kane: "No, name the Commissions."

Peters: "Yes, but so you understand, Doug. We're taking from 3385 and putting those into 3069 so that they are in one Bill. And those Commissions are Economic Development, Legislative Investigation, Water Resources, Legislative Audit, Joint Committee on Administrative Legislative Rules, Transportation Study, Insurance Laws, Motor Vehicles, Joint Committee on Regulatory Agency, Pioneer Memorial Plaza, Uniformity of Legislation, Legislative Advisory to the RTA, CDB for Pioneer Memorial, Chain-O-Lakes Fox River. It's whatever was on the Calendar on Page 2."

Kane: "So included in that is....on that construction of..... what's with the Pioneer Memorial Plaza?"

Peters: "I haven't the slightest idea, Representative Kane. These came out of the Committee you're a Member of."

Kane: "It's 300 thousand dollars for a piece of concrete between here and the State Office Building?"

Peters: "That could well be, Representative Kane."

Kane: "You're offering 2 million dollars worth of Amendments that you don't know what's in it?"

Peters: "This Bill is on the Calendar on Second Reading. What I am trying to do, with the agreement of both Representatives Younge and Representative Matijevich, is take these and stick them all in one Bill."

Kane: "So if we vote 'no' we can kill about thirty Commissions all at once and save 2 million dollars?"

Peters: "Well...it'd be easier for you to vote, yeah. Also for a lot of people."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, originally I had about ten Amendments filed to the other Bill, 3385, to kill all of these Commissions one at a time. So here we have at one fell swoop a chance to kill them all and not only do that, but save the time of the House on going through those other Amendments. And I would urge the defeat of this Amendment to....3069...what's



the number of the Amendment?"

Peters: Thirteen."

Kane: "Number 13."

Peters: "Representative Kane, let me indicate, that if you would feel better if I would withdraw the Amendment and you want to go one at a time, I'd be happy to do that?"

Kane: "No, I think we'd like to get them all together. Two million dollars in one swoop, particularly when they are for such things as the Joint Commission on Regulatory Agency Reform for 300 thousand.....Joint Commission on Administrative Rules for 381 thousand, a Memorial Plaza for 300 thousand. I think it would be easier to take them all at once."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski. Representative Martin."

Martin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the problem with this Amendment is that there may well be some decent Commissions on that list. Now the Amendments that Representative.....excuse me, let Representative DiPrima carry on his business. I don't know about Representative Hanahan's feelings about this, but he was with three of the rest of us, the Joint Sponsors of the Amendments to cut out the other Commissions. And we wanted to give the Members an individual chance to vote. Now I know we're all tired and I don't look forward to that either, but you and I all know that there's no way that this Amendment will be defeated. Which means that some not very good Commissions are going to be funded again for another year when you, as House Members, very wisely rid yourself of other Commissions with the other Amendments. And then it will never be called. I don't think you're giving yourself an opportunity to pick and choose. But if that's the will of the House, so be it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane....you've been up once."

Kane: "Could I ask the Sponsor one more question? And that is



....and this might save the time of the House. If this Amendment is defeated, then would you agree to take it out of the other Bill?"

Peters: "Absolutely not. You couldn't. I can't do that it would....."

Kane: "Then would you withdraw this Amendment?"

Peters: "If....I...."

Kane: "Let's just vote on this once."

Peters: "That's fine, O.K. If this Amendment is adopted, it puts this in the other Bill but the other Bill still stays here."

Kane: "No, there you've got it both ways."

Peters: "That's true."

Kane: "Then you ought to accept....let's vote on it once. If it goes down, you'll take the Commissions out of the other Bill."

Peters: "Representative, I can't. It's Representative Matijevich's Bill."

Kane: "Could we get that agreement from Representative Matijevich?"

Peters: "I don't know that he would want to agree to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten. Anything further? The question is on Representative Peters' motion for the adoption of Amendment #13. 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 84 'aye', 45 'no', the motion carries and Amendment #13 is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make a point. I guess under Robert's rules you can deliberate on the very same thing two days in row. This is the one we put on my Bill,



right, Pete?"

Speaker Redmond: "3148."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3148. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Illinois Department of Conservation."

Speaker Redmond: "No Committee Amendments are there?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3316."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3316. A Bill for an Act to...."

Speaker Redmond: "3316. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to change the name of the Illinois Institute of Environmental Quality to the Illinois Institute of Energy and Environmental Resources."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3383."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3383. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Insurance. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendment 1."

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Cunningham."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would you take this Bill out of the record, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record by request of the Sponsor. 3385."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3385. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to various boards and Commissions. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to the enumerated Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16, Kane, amends House Bill



3385 as amended by deleting Section 6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #16 strikes Section 6 of the Bill which funds the Transportation Study Commission for 383 thousand, 700 dollars. We've gone through these arguments before. I think we should take a vote on each of these Amendments. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Byers: "Representative Kane, can you tell me how many or how much the budget was for last year for this Commission? How much was the budget last year?"

Kane: "You would have to ask the Sponsor of the Bill that. They're asking for 383 thousand, 700 this year and I think the functions of Transportation Study Commission can well be handled by our standing Committee structure."

Byers: "Thank you. I'll vote with you, Representative Kane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess it's an inquiry of the Chair or of the Sponsor of the Amendment or the Bill. If we were to adopt Representative Kane's Amendment to abolish this and having already taken action to move it from this Bill in to House Bill 3069, would the Commission still exist? And if it does, why doesn't the Sponsor just table this Bill since everything has been moved into another Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I'd do that except there's some other Amendments coming down the pike I guess that aren't included in the other Bills, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well then the action that we're taking on this Amendment would be fruitless seeing the appropriation has



already been transferred to another Amendment... And the order of taking up the Amendment, I think, is dilatory, even though I support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "This is the Commission that decided that...they thought the best way to build a four-lane highway through Dupage County was to make it a toll way. It is one of the few roads in the state that would justify the building of a toll way. But on the other hand, it's the highway in the state that deserves the building of a four-lane highway most throughout the entire state. This Commission is in favor of building toll ways in the Chicago Metropolitan areas so that we can build freeways in Southeastern Illinois. That is a very weird way for a Commission to represent the best interests of the state. So I think if you're interested in not ruining the Morton arboretum or other environmentally pure areas which would not have to have an environmental impact statement prepared prior to the construction of such a road...you wouldn't want to vote for this Commission. It seems to come up with nothing but bad ideas. I think this is where the Regional Transportation Authority came from, I'm not sure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "The Illinois Transportation Study Commission's request for 383 thousand and 700 dollars is only exceeded by their estimated expenditures of 374 thousand dollars and their...of last year. So they're going to expend possibly 383 thousand and 700 dollars unless this Amendment is adopted. I'd suggest to the Membership of the House that there are a lot better ways of spending these amounts of money. The money certainly could be from the Road Fund...and that's what I would like to point out. This is not money out of general revenue. We're not going to be talking about money we could send to education,



but this is 383 thousand, 700 dollars that could be best used for filling the potholes around the state instead of for a few people to sit around on contractual service, earning high fees, for doing the same thing that the Illinois Department of Transportation is charged by statute to be doing. And that is for undertaking the responsibility of taking care of our road needs. Now it seems a complete duplication of effort, a complete waste of the taxpayer's tax dollars on our gas tax and I suggest it's a good Amendment and it should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is really a Catch 22 for me because I believe firmly that all Commissions and departments should not be spending out of the Road Fund. It ought to be General Revenue Fund. And this Commission is being funded by the Road Fund. Which Representative Hanahan is correct on that basis in the past I've had Bills, House Bill 701 for one, that always mandated no more diversion from road funds for departments and Commissions. So I think what the Catch 22 is...here's one that you know we put everybody else back in and now some people are shooting at this one. I think what's interesting is, especially when you talk about whether or not this Commission does any work like Mr. Skinner claims, this Commission is probably one of the finest I believe. It's the Commission that started out the Supplemental Freeway Program in the late 60's or early 70's. It's under contractual...you talk about a contractual guy, there's not another man in the state that knows roads, the road program or RTA like Bob Blair. And further, when you talk about catching things the Governor says that he's got a 664 million dollar road program last year. And through our investigation we found out that that it a farce. The road program is really 350 million



dollars. He's going to have about 310 million that he lapsed that can go in to this next year which is a campaign year. This Commission, I think, does an excellent job. Although it's really a Catch 22 for me because road fund money....I think it's unfortunate that you pick on this one that may be successful and then you put all the other ones back in."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Transportation Study Commission has been brought out here by the previous speaker. It's probably one of the most knowledgeable and working Commissions that this Assembly has. And over the years it's laid out plans, the interstate roads, practically all of them were laid out under the plans of the Transportation Study Commission. The Commission has done many worthy causes. I am surprised that anybody would take a whack at this particular Commission because it is one Commission that certainly has accomplished much more than the money we've spent out. And I would hope that we would definitely vote to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I Chaired this Commission. I've been in this General Assembly for a few years. I've served in both Houses of the General Assembly. I've the Commission formula at work in both Chambers of the House. There is no finer Commission serving in the General Assembly than the Transportation Study Commission. This Transportation Study Commission serves a very, very useful purpose. This is the conduit between the General Assembly and the great Department of Transportation with their very large budget. We're talking about a budget of almost a billion dollars every year. This is the only Commission that keeps the Department of Transportation, the General Assembly and the public all tied in one ball so that we



do know what we're doing in that Department, Mr. Speaker. And further, every...this Commission has always been a nonpartisan Commission. We have with us the finest staff that you can get in any State of the Union serving for this Commission. This Commission is a working Commission that's visited geographically every area in the state, every particular area that has a problem when it comes to highways or their needs. This Commission becomes acquainted with it and has done the job for the General Assembly. If any Amendment should go down in defeat, it is this Amendment. It's a very poor Amendment. It does not belong in the General Assembly. I urge it's defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suppose we all try to interpret what they did out in California. But one of the messages from my constituents and...I think all of us...are telling us, is that if there's something that's a duplication, that's unnecessary, why, get get rid of it instead of paying for it. Now Representative Garmisa, who is a distinguished Member of this House and a very conscientious Chairman of this Commission, describes it as a conduit...a conduit. Well this is a conduit that the people can do without. We don't need a conduit. The Department of Transportation and the Members of the General Assembly can pick up the telephone and talk to each other. They can write letters. They don't need an expensive Commission that is a conduit. Now the principal accomplishment of this Commission is to have written the RTA Bill and to establish the RTA. If there's anything that has tied up the Chicago Metropolitan area and loaded something on the taxpayers that they didn't want, a five percent gas tax, this is this Commission. Now if you like the five percent gas tax and you like the way that the RTA is functioning, why reward this Commission by continuing it. But I think we



have a Department of Transportation, we have a General Assembly with Transportation Committees and we don't need any agency, any conduit in the middle. This is a perfect example of something that is unnecessary. Although there are fine, distinguished Members of the General Assembly like Representative Neff and Representative Garmisa serving on it. But nonetheless, the State of Illinois would not disappear tomorrow and the transportation policies could still be moved forward with excellence without this Commission. And I urge you to all think very carefully about this and to vote to eliminate this particular duplicative Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Adams."

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

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

Kane: "Not to belabor the point, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're not picking on this particular Commission, we're offering Amendments to strike each individual Commission that's in the Bill singly. And we want the House to vote on these Commissions so we don't vote on the package. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my 'no' vote. I think that the remarks of Representative Garmisa were most appropriate. If there is any Commission which performs a useful function to the General Assembly, it is the Transportation Study Commission. The Amendment ought to be defeated."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes' and 72 'noes' and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #17, Kane, amends House Bill 3385 as amended by deleting Section 7."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #17 abolishes Section 7 which provides for the funding for the Insurance Laws Commission. And for the same reasons that we're urging a vote on the other Commissions, I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #17."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sorry that this matter has to come up at this time because I would like to take time and explain exactly what the Commission has done over the past several years. The time is short, I won't waste too much time. We do have ten Members of the Commission, five Senators, five Republicans. We have three paid employees. And each year we introduce our own Bills and attempt to justify our own budget. As far back as the inception of the Commission, it was the Commission that initiated the insolvency of the Guarantee Fund, which today makes it possible for all companies which are in business to operate without any fear of insolvency in as far as the insured is concerned. During that time we have introduced 86 Bills which have been suggested by the Commission of which 72 have passed. Even this last year, up to the present time, we had 57 individual complaints from consumers. And of those 57 complaints we satisfactorily resolved 51 of them. Three we didn't do too well on and three are still pending. I might add that we...part of the cost of the Commission unfortunately is borne by the Chairman. We provide an office, secretarial help and



telephone service at no charge to the Commission, which enables us to keep our budget at a very low level. I doubt that there are too many Members on the floor of the House who have not at one time or another come to the Commission and asked for their assistance for one of their constituents. Finally I might add, that the Commission has also ridden herd to the best of its ability on the Department of Insurance. Time and again when we have found fault with the department, we have called it to their attention and called it to the attention of the Legislature as well. I think we get full value for our money. I would like to see the Commission perpetuated and I would appreciate your defeating this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I still awaited, a long awaited, an explanation of the need to spend money on contractual services and travel that are requested in all these Commission's recommendations. In this Bill, in this recommendation, there's 52 thousand and 88 dollars recommended for contractual services. And there is 9 thousand dollars requested of the taxpayer's money for travel. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, once again is this money more needed to put a bunch of insurance executives together on contractual expenditures and send them around the country or wherever they want to go to talk about insurance laws when everyone knows that our Insurance Committee of the House and the Senate is adequately staffed, if not they should be given more staffing to do the very job that this Insurance Study Commission purports to do. I have no quarrel with the Chairman or the former Chairman of this or anything they have ever done or hope to do. I just say that there is a better way of spending 85 thousand dollars of the taxpayer's money than to provide luxurious accommodations at dinners and hotels for travel for Members of the



General Assembly and public members who are well paid insurance executives in the main who serve on this kind of Commission. And I support the Gentleman's motion for adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kane, to close. Representative Huff, pardon me."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising to support this Amendment. I read the report from the Illinois Insurance Laws Study Commission. And I had to give up in disgust because it was full of ifs, ands, and buts. It doesn't say anything definitive except that in this opinion there was no redlining. Now the Representative came up with some arbitrary figure of 57 complaints in this area of redlining and he claims they found all of them but one. I submit that 56 of them must have lived in the building of the Commission Members. Because if he came on the South side or the West side of Chicago and the North side he would find thousands of such complaints. And I'm not going to give my vote for one dime for these hang back safety first people on this Commission. I think the right vote would be a vote for this Amendment. And I am urging everybody to follow my vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have an Insurance Committee in the House. We have an Insurance Committee in the Senate. I don't think that we need an Insurance Laws Study Commission to duplicate the work that the Committees could do. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #17. 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 is 46 'aye' and 87 'no' and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #18, Kane, amends House Bill 3385 as



amended by deleting Section 9."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #18 deletes Section 9 which appropriates 100 thousand dollars for the Joint Commission on Regulatory Agency Reform. As I understand it the substantive legislation to create this is stalled somewhere in the Senate and it's not going anywhere. So I would urge the deletion of this appropriation. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. 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 100 'aye' and 23 'no' and the motion carries. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #19, Kane, amends House Bill 3385 as amended by deleting Section 10."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #19 deletes Section 10 which appropriates 3 thousand dollars for the Pioneer Memorial Plaza Commission. I think that you ought to look also at the subsequent Amendment which...Section 13 which appropriates 300 thousand dollars to create a Pioneer Memorial Plaza between the State Capitol Building and the State Office Building. I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Having been a Member of this Commission I can 100% agree with Representative Kane's move to cut out the money from the Commission. There is...even if we are going to build the plaza, even if we are going to build the plaza, I have nothing against that, it can be coordinated by the Capital Development Board and the States Needs Commission. And as another Springfield Representative, I join Representative Kane in voting against 3 thousand



dollars for another Springfield project."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I have a feeling Representative DiPrima doesn't support this just from watching his actions over there on the floor. So don't hit him, Larry."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield my time to Representative DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima, do you want to accept his yield? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Well, I can just say with regard to the Amendment, we did hammer this out in Committee and I suggest a 'no' vote. It was heard in Subcommittee. It was heard in a full Committee. And I certainly think that the Committee's action was correct. So I solicit your red light."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Listen, just think what may....let me keep the Commission. I prefer that we vote 'yes'. All right 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the.....Representative Kane, would you care to close?"

Kane: "I think we all understand this Amendment and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #19. 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 is 52 'aye' and 85 'no' and the motion fails. Any further motions....Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #20, Kane, amends House Bill 3385 as amended by deleting Section 11."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Section 11 creates the uniformity of Legislation.... Commission for....and appropriates 30 thousand dollars."



I think this same kind of work can be done by the Reference Bureau and the Council and by our Judiciary Committees. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #20."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's something a little special about this Commission which I think would deserve a 'no' vote and that's because I'm on it. Very briefly, by statute the State of Illinois has been a member of the National Commission of the Uniform State Laws since about 1903. The Chairman...the Secretary of our Commission is George Nichols of the Reference Bureau...and it's an excellent Commission and should receive your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Once again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a funny way of appropriating money to the Reference Bureau. Very honestly, it's sort of silly that we take another 30 thousand dollars out of General Revenue and mask it by having a separate Commission expended for the purposes of having our Reference Bureau belong to the Uniformity Conference which....since 1903 or 1907 we've belonged to....the National Conference on Commissions of Uniform State Laws. Actually that's where 19 thousand and 300 dollars of this 30 thousand dollars goes to. The other 9 thousand dollars goes to travel. Now the fact remains that the Reference Bureau of our General Assembly needs another 19 thousand to keep up with the appropriations....to the appropriation that would be used for the contribution to the National Conference on Commissions on Uniform State Law. We should amend the Reference Bureau's appropriation. If we need 9 thousand dollars more money for somebody to travel to figure it out, we should say it. But this iswe're actually hiding behind the fact. And I suggest



an 'aye' vote on this Amendment... is a good vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Greiman: "Would some... maybe Mr. Leinenweber should yield for the question. Is this the Commission that allows Illinois Representatives, public and legislative, to go to the conferences where the uniform laws are adopted, is that what this is essentially?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "That's not quite it, but it's fairly close.

There's a National Conference of Commissions of Uniform State Laws which Illinois is a part of and Illinois does have a procedure for selection of Commissioners to the Commission on Uniform State Laws who do meet and do consider whether or not uniform laws should be written and are sent around for adoption by...."

Greiman: "Is that what this Commission does?"

Leinenweber: "That's correct."

Greiman: "On the Amendment, the Commission is a very important task and a very important function. I'm not on the Commission. But many of our laws in recent years have come from uniform acts with an attempt to bring uniformity. Whether we like them or not, we vote on them. Our Sales Acts, our Negotiable Instruments Act... hundreds of the Acts that we pass come from the Uniform Commissioners. And what we will be doing is cutting Illinois off from input into the Uniform Commissioners. Illinois will not have that kind of input and I think that it is important that the Illinois Legal Community have that kind of input into the National Uniform Laws. We would be doing a very dangerous thing to this rather important endeavor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I too rise in opposition to this particular Amendment to House Bill



3385. The Uniform Law Commissioners is a Commission to which I believe all of the fifty states now belong. And Representative Greiman was absolutely correct in saying that they try to work out the conflicts and differences between the laws of various states for the transactions that necessarily occur across state lines so that you can look forward to a uniform kind of procedure throughout the state, throughout all of the states of this Union in various fields in which these conflicts have arisen. There are a lot of them that have not been worked out, but many that have. And one of them of course is very prominently in the field of sales. But there's been lots of uniform laws in the fields of criminal law. Many of the other areas that transcend state boundaries and make it very difficult if we do not find some means of uniformity to do business between the various states and also to know when you go from one state to another what you can expect in the kind of law that you have to submit yourself to. This is long-standing Commission that is of great significance in the field of law throughout the entire United States. And it would be a tragedy if Illinois were no longer a part of it. And travel is absolutely necessary for these...the Commission does not meet necessarily in Illinois. It may meet here sometimes but they meet at various locations around the United States for the convenience of all the Commissioners of all of the various states."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I think everyone that is arguing against this appropriation is just jealous. We would all like to go to Vail, Colorado. We would all like to go to New York City. So I wonder if some Member of this Commission could put in the record, the Members of the fortunate... twelve or so, some of whom I understand are very famous attorneys who charge very large fees to defend clients



that get immunity for corporations and put our Members in jail."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't think there's any question here with Representative Kane or those who are in support of this Amendment that the State of Illinois should not participate in uniform laws. That's not the question at all. The point that Representative Kane is trying to make and Mr. Hanahan also said that if we are going to do this, why don't we just appropriate the extra money for the Reference Bureau or for the Legislative Council or some existing agency and plus up their budget by 10 or 20 thousand dollars and do it that way. There is absolutely no need to create Commission after Commission after Commission. Many Commissions that we've had, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, have served a very useful purpose. And usually within one term, they write their report and that should be the end of them. But we keep going with the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Study and Spanish People Study and we're studying everything to death. Now we can participate, which we should on uniform laws throughout the country, but the point that is trying to be made here is that we don't need a separate Commission to do it. If we want to participate, which I think we should, let's do it through the Reference Bureau or let's do it through the Legislative Council and give them an extra 10 or 20 thousand dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

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

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd



urge the adoption of this Amendment. I think that we have enough duplication. We have about 20 Committees in the House and another 15 or 18 Committees in the Senate. We have a number of Joint Committees that have been created by Joint Resolutions. And then we have about 90 Commissions...and if the Representative from Chicago has his way, there's going to be about 190 Commissions next year on about 600 different Bills. So I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #20. All 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 52 'ayes' and 73 'no' and the motion failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #21, Kane, amends House Bill 3385 as amended by deleting Section 12."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #21 appropriates 5 thousand dollars for the Advisory Committee on RTA. I would suggest that our Appropriation Committees as well as our Motor Vehicle Laws and other Committees that deal with issue of transportation can adequately deal with the subject that would be handled by the Advisory Committee on RTA. And I would urge the adoption of Amendment #21."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 21. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Amendment #21 is adopted. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I didn't get up because we've been defeating most of these, but I think that this one is required by the Enabling Act. So I think....I really don't care.... Commissions never excited me anyway. The farthest I ever



got was Edwardsville, Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #22, Kane, amends House Bill 3385 as amended by deleting Section 13."

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

Robinson: "While this is being debated, I'd like to question the germaneness of Amendment #1 which changes the title of the Bill. And in previous rulings that you have made and in rulings that Mr. Epstein has discussed on Election Bills and others, is said that an Amendment cannot change the title of the Bill after First Reading...after the title is read in First Reading. So I would like to question the germaneness of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the status of Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Was there any motion filed with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "It seems to me that your motion...your inquiry is too late, Representative Robinson. Representative Kane, on Amendment #22."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker...one more, Representative Geo-Karis, Amendment #22 appropriates 300 thousand dollars for the Pioneer Memorial Plaza which I understand it is going to be a piece of concrete of some form or other between the State Capitol Building and the State Office Building. And I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #22 which would save the state taxpayers 300 thousand dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we destroy this Amendment. Vote it down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "I would urge an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #22. Those in favor say 'yes', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'noes' have it and the motion failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #23, Kane, amends House Bill 3385 as amended by deleting Section 14."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #23 appropriates 30 thousand dollars to the Chain-O-Lakes Fox River Commission, 10 thousand dollars to the Aggregate Mining Problems Study Commission, 27 thousand dollars to the Election Laws Commission, 88 thousand, 8 hundred dollars to the County Problems Study Commission, 30 thousand to the Law Revision Commission, 20 thousand dollars to the Kankakee River Commission, 25 thousand dollars to the Recreation Council and 20 thousand dollars to the Electronic Fund Transfer System Study Commission. A total aggregate of approximately 250 thousand dollars. And I think that most of these studies have been done or are in the process of being done and can be done by existing Committees. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment which would eliminate a large amount of duplication with our standing Committees, the Municipal Committees, the County Problems....and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Amendment. I think that the Ph.D. from Springfield has got a piece of bailing wire that's broken loose someplace in.....he's not checked with any of the Members of most of these Commissions or Councils or the Chairmen or whatever. And for that reason I oppose this. And to give you a classic example, the Recreation Council I know is a nebulous Commission. We spend about 20 thousand dollars a year and with our long range



recreation program through the Department of Conservation, this year you will receive 17 million dollars in federal funds because of their program. And that's the reason I got kind of warm when the Representative from Sangamon tries to create this facade. I move that we defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I serve on one of these Commissions and personal basis say to you that the Commission is not needed as set up by statute. It should be abolished and should not be funded as such. Most of these Commissions, whether it be the Recreation Commission, the County Problems Commission or the Fox Lake Chain-O-Lake to the Kankakee River Commission, all of these Commissions as laudable as they are and as wonderful as the job that they may have performed in a society of 1978 and 79 are just not needed any longer. What we do need, what we do need is the proper funding of our Committees of the House and the Senate so that those Members serving on those Committees become experts in the fields of their choice. And they, not public Members or Members who are not elected to the House or the Senate, serve on those Committees and be experts whether it be in water problems or in County problems. That's what the Committee system is all about....to continue the body that we have created over the years and expend the hundreds and millions of dollars...hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars we have been expending for a continuation of these Commissions is just foolish. We should be spending this money on increased salaries for Legislators and increasing our staffing ability for our Committees. And I support the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kane, to close."

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



think it's time to eliminate the duplication and waste in our General Assembly. If we're going to demand the respect of the taxpayers, we're going to have to put our own House in order first. Eliminate the kind of duplication and wasteful spending of money that we engage in every year.

I urge the adoption of Amendment #23."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #23. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 45 'ayes' and 72 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "For the purpose of taking this Bill out of the record, please. And then I'm going to make an announcement. My Committee meets in the morning at 9 o'clock A.M. in room 114. I hope everybody's there, especially Democrats."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Appropriations II will meet promptly at 9:00 A.M. tomorrow morning in room 118."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion... that we adjourn after a couple of messages from the Senate read by the Clerk. Those....motion carries. Go ahead and read the messages."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2834, 3002, 3004, 3083, 3097, 3111,



3118, 2855, 2875, 2893, 2899, 2963, 2998, 3152, 3277.
 Passed by the Senate June 23, 1977. Kenneth Wright,
 Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,
 Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the
 House of Representative that the Senate has concurred
 with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following
 title, to wit: House Bills number 2835, 2869, 2950,
 2999, 3006, 2808, 2842, 3151, 2969, 2946, 2928, 2894,
 and 2983 together with Amendments passed by the Senate
 as amended June 23, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

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

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, is it too late to get leave of the
 House to vote 'yes' on a certain Bill today that I
 missed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we haven't yet adjourned."

Mulcahey: "I'd like to recorded as voting 'aye' on House
 Bill....."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection,
 leave is granted."

Mulcahey: "I'd like to have leave to vote 'yes' on House Bill
or Senate Bill, I'm sorry, 1419. It won't change the o

Speaker Redmond: "No objection, leave is granted. Now.....
 Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3413, Antonovych, a Bill for an Act
 in relation to Abused and Neglected Nursing Home Patient
 Reporting. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Madigan's
 motion that the House adjourn. The House now stands
 adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. Ten o'clock,
 ten, ten o'clock, the House."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	12:05	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
		Speaker Redmond	
2		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Journal
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Moves to suspend reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
3		Speaker Redmond	
		McBroom	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1089
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stiehl	
4		Speaker Redmond	
		Stiehl	Senate Amendment #157
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	



2.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2549
		Madigan	HB 2549, no file - Out of the record
		Speaker Redmond	HB 2597
5		Williams	
6-7		Brady	
8	12:25	Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	Support
		Williams	
		Speaker Redmond	
9		Bluthardt	
		Williams	Moves to concur - SA #1 & 2
		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
		Levin	HB 2605 - SA #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		(Kempiners ((Levin	Questions
10		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
		Reilly	HB 2648 - SA #1
		Matijeovich	In Chair
		McClain	
		Speaker Matijeovich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Byers	Questions
		Reilly	
11		Speaker Matijevec	House non-concurs
	12:36	Chapman	HB 2661 - Amendment #1
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Porter	
		Speaker Matijevec	
12		McClain	Point of order
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Daniels	
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Chapman	To close
13		Speaker Matijevec	House concurs
		Kempiners	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Speaker Matijevec	
14		Schlickman	HB 2671 - SA #1
		Speaker Matijevec	House concurs
		Pullen	HB 2685 - SA #1
		Speaker Matijevec	
15		Levin	HB 2685 (cont.)
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Pullen	To close
16		Speaker Matijevec	House concurs
		DiPrima	HB 2839 - SA #1
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Johnson	Yield



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		DiPrima	
	12:50	Speaker Matijevich	House concurs
		McClain	HB 2945 - SA #1 & 2
		Speaker Matijevich	
18		(Skinner ((McClain	Asks TOOR
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Stiehl	HB 3351 - SA #1
19		Speaker Matijevich	House non-concurs
		Friedrich	HB 3372 - SA #1
		Speaker Matijevich	House concurs
		McClain	HB 2945 - SA #1
20		Speaker Matijevich	House concurs
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 238 - 3rd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Porter	TOOR
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 395, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	Leave to return to 2nd Reading
21		Speaker Matijevich	Leave granted
		Hoffman	Leave to table #2
		Speaker Matijevich	
	12:59	Hoffman	Withdraw Amendment #2



5.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Brady	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #3
		Hoffman	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Satterthwaite	
22		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	Hold on 2nd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 554, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
23-24		Terzich	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Wolf	Yield
		(
		(Terzich	
25		Speaker Matijevich	
		Skinner	Explains vote
		Speaker Matijevich	SB 554 - Passed
26		Schlickman	Point of order
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 771, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
27		Getty	
		Speaker Matijevich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	1:13	Kosinski	Support
		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Leinenweber	Question
28		(Getty	
		Speaker Matijevich	
29		(Greisheimer	Yield
		(Getty	
		Speaker Matijevich	
30		(Friedrich	Yield
		(Getty	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Geo-Karis	Yield
31		(Getty	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Darrow	Moves previous question
		Speaker Matijevich	
32		Getty	To close
		Speaker Matijevich	
33		Schlickman	
		Speaker Matijevich	SB 771 - Passed
	1:25	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1055, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	Leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Matijevich	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
		Hoffman	



7.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
34		Speaker Matijevich Hoffman	SB 1055, Amendment #2 adopted, 3rd Reading
35		Speaker Matijevich Clerk O'Brien Speaker Matijevich Yourell Speaker Matijevich	SB 1419, 3rd Reading
36		Collins Speaker Matijevich	Oppose
37		Robinson Speaker Matijevich Mahar	Support
38		Speaker Matijevich Conti Speaker Matijevich	
39	1:37	Tipsword Speaker Matijevich	
40		Bluthardt Speaker Matijevich Davis, J. Speaker Matijevich	Urge 'yes' vote Moves previous question
41		Yourell Speaker Matijevich	To close
42		Skinner Speaker Matijevich Bowman	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
43		Pullen	
		Speaker Matijevich	SB 1419, 3rd Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1562, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Martin, L.	Leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Matijevich	Leave granted
		Martin, L.	
		Tuerk	Leave to table Amendment #2
		Speaker Matijevich	Leave granted
		Tuerk	Leave to withdraw Amendment #6
44		Speaker Matijevich	Withdrawn
	1:47	Tipsword	Question
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #4 reconsidered- Withdrawn
		Turek	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		(Mautino	Yield
		(
		(Tuerk	
		Speaker Matijevich	TOOR
45		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1570, 3rd Reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
		McAuliffe	Leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Matijevich	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1'
		Speaker Matijevich	
		McAuliffe	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #1 is adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		McAuliffe		
46		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment adopted, 3rd Reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1785, 3rd Reading	
		Speaker Matijevich		
47	1:53	Lechowicz	Explains vote	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		(Porter	Yield	
		(
		(Lechowicz		
		Speaker Matijevich		
48		Walsh	Opposes	
		Speaker Matijevich		
49		Campbell	Supports	
		Speaker Matijevich		
50		Pierce	Supports	
	2:00	Speaker Giorgi	In the Chair	
51		(Schuneman	Yield	
		(
		(Lechowicz		
		Speaker Giorgi		
52		Mugalian	Opposes	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		(Matula		
		(
		(Lechowicz		
		Speaker Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
53	2:05	Hoffman	Opposes
		Speaker Giorgi	
54		Antonovych	Supports
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Tipsword	Moves previous question
		Speaker Giorgi	
55	2:10	Lechowicz	To close on SB 1785
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Geo-Karis	Explains vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Giorgi	
56		Skinner	Explains vote
		Speaker Giorgi	SB 1785 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1630
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Telcser	Move back to 2nd Reading
		Speaker Giorgi	SB 1630 - back to 2nd
		Telcser	Explains Amendment #1
57		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #1 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1847
		Speaker Giorgi	
	2:15	Daniels	Explains SB 1847
		Speaker Giorgi	
		(Huskey	Yield - Opposes
		(
58-59		(Daniels	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
60	2:20	Bartulis	Opposes
61		Speaker Giorgi	
		Schlickman	Opposes
62		Speaker Giorgi	
		Neff	
		Speaker Giorgi	
63		Willer	
		Speaker Giorgi	
64-65-66		(Matula (Daniels	Yield - discussion
		Speaker Giorgi	
67		Bennett	Supports
	2:35	Speaker Giorgi	
68		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mautino	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		(Daniels (
69		(Mautino	
		Speaker Giorgi	
70		Houlihan	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		(Rigney (
71	2:42	(Daniels	
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Flinn	Moves previous question
		Speaker Giorgi	
72		Daniels	To close
		Speaker Giorgi	
		McMaster	Explains vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
73		Friedrich	Explains vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
		McPike	Explains vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
74		Kelly	Explains vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Schuneman	Explains vote
		Speaker Giorgi	HB 1847 - Passed
		Byers	
75		Speaker Giorgi	
		Wolf	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 395 - returned to 2nd Reading and held
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Hoffman	Amendment #3
		(Houlihan	Question
		(
76	2:52	(Hoffman	
		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #3 - adopted
		Adams	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Davis, J.	Point of personal privilege
77		Speaker Giorgi	
		Robinson	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Marovitz	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2632, 2nd Reading
		Speaker Giorgi	
78		Marovitz	Amendment #20 - Move to table
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kosinski	
		Speaker Giorgi	
79		Bowman	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Speaker Giorgi	
		McClain	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
80		Davis, J.	
	3:00	Leverenz	
81		Speaker Giorgi	
		(Skinner	Point of order
		(
		(Speaker Giorgi	
		Schneider	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #20
		Speaker Giorgi	
82		Hoffman	
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
83		Brady	Urge 'no' vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
84		Byers	
		Speaker Giorgi	
85		Telcser	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Hanahan	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
86-87		Conti	
		Speaker Giorgi	
88		Stuffle	Oppose motion to table
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Katz	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
89		Barnes, E.M.	
	3:22	Speaker Giorgi	
		Tuerk	Moves previous question
		Speaker Giorgi	
90		Marovitz	To close
		Speaker Giorgi	
91		Hoffman	Explain vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kelly	Oppose
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Totten	
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
92		Friedrich Speaker Giorgi	
93		Davis, J. Speaker Giorgi Skinner Speaker Giorgi	Point of personal privilege
94		Antonovych Speaker Giorgi Cunningham Speaker Giorgi	
95		Marovitz Speaker Giorgi	Explain vote
96		Houlihan Speaker Giorgi	Explain vote
	3:25	Marovitz Speaker Giorgi Waddell Speaker Giorgi Clerk O'Brien Speaker Giorgi Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees Poll absentees Leave to be verified Poll absentees
97		Reilly Speaker Giorgi Boucek Speaker Giorgi	Leave to be verified Leave to be verified



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Giorgi	
98		Marovitz	Questions Roll Call
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Caldwell	Votes 'aye'
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Marovitz	Continues questions
99		Speaker Giorgi	Motion to table fails
	3:43	Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Anderson	Amendment #11 - Move to table
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Hanahan	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
100		Hoffman	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Byers	Support
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Anderson	To close
		Speaker Giorgi	Motion prevails
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Anderson	Questions germaneness of Amendment #10
101		Speaker Giorgi	Too late
		Madison	Yield to Barnes
		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Barnes, E.M.	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #23
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Kane	Withdraw
		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #23 withdrawn
	3:51	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #24
102		Speaker Giorgi	
103		Kane	
		Lechowicz	
		(Meyer	Questions
		(
		(Kane	
104		(Madison	Questions
		(
		(Kane	
105		(McClain	Questions
		(
		(Kane	
		Speaker Lechowicz	In the Chair
		(Geo-Karis	Questions
		(
		(Kane	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
106		Meyer	Responds to Geo-Karis
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
107-108		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Kane	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	4:08	Lucco	
109-110		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #24 fails
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	
111		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #25 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #26
		Schneider	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
112-113		Robinson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Brady	
114		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	4:20	(Schneider	To close
		(
115		(Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schneider	Withdraw Amendment #26
		Speaker Lechowicz	Withdrawn - Amendment #10 is germane
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #27
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
116		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
117		Hoffman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
118		Birchler	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
119		Satterthwaite	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	Urge 'no' vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
120		Brady	Urge 'no' vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #27 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #28
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Polk	Amendment out of order
121		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes, J.	Move to table Amendment #28
		Speaker Lechowicz	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #29
		Barnes, J.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
122	4:37	Brady	Support
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes, J.	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
123		Byers	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #29 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #30
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
124		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	To close
125		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #30 - Passed
		Madison	Move to table Amendment #15
126		Speaker Lechowicz	Tabled - 3rd Reading
		Byers	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2973
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2978
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Catania	Motion to table Amendments #2 & 3
127		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	Question
		Catania	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendments #2 & 3 tabled
		Catania	Amendment #4
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tip sword	
128		Catania	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leverenz	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
129		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #4 tabled
		Catania	Asks TOOR
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 3069
		Clerk O'Brien	
130		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Younge	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #11
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Wikoff	Withdraws Amendment #11
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #12
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schuneman	Withdraws Amendment #12
		Speaker Lechowicz	
131		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #13
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	Withdraws Amendment #13
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #14
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #15
		Speaker Lechowicz	
132		Kelly	Moves for adoption of Amendment #15
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mahar	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		(Mahar	Yield
		(
		(Kelly	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #16
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
133		Hudson	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Flinn	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Speaker Lechowicz	
134		Davis, J.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
135-136		Hanahan	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #17
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #17 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #18
		Speaker Lechowicz	
137		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
138		Lucco	Oppose
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Davis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #18 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #19
		Speaker Lechowicz	
139-140		Hanahan	
		Brummer	Leave to consider Amendments #19-36 -- 1 Roll Call
		Hanahan	No objection
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
141		Marovitz	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Yourell	Roll Call
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	
142		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
143		Martin, L.	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #20
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Lechowicz	
144		Pullen	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
145		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
146		Campbell	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	5:30	Houlihan	Explains vote
147		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kempiners	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #20 fails
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #21
		Speaker Lechowicz	
148		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
149		Hoffman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #21 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #22
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Rigney	
150		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	
		Rigney	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kane	
151		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #22 fails
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #23
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
152		Mahar	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
153		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Byers	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #23 - Passed
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #24
		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
155		Younge	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Martin, L.	
	5:48	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #24 - Passed
156		Clerk Hall	Amendment #25
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Peters	Asks for division
157		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment not divisable



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
158	5:52	Hanahan Speaker Lechowicz	Continues
159		Waddell Speaker Lechowicz	
160		(Johnson ((Hanahan Speaker Lechowicz	Questions Amendment #25 fails
161		Giorgi Speaker Lechowicz	
162		Clerk Hall Hanahan Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #26
		Houlihan Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #26 fails
		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #27
		Younger Speaker Lechowicz	Moves to table Amendment #27
		Clerk O'Brien Lucco Speaker Lechowicz	Tabled Amendment #28 Withdraw
		Clerk O'Brien Marovitz	Withdrawn Amendment #29
163	6:05	Speaker Lechowicz	
164		Schlickman Speaker Lechowicz	Oppose



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	
165		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Sandquist	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Madison	Voting 'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	6:12	Wolf	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
167		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bowman	
168		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
169		Marovitz	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Meyer	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	Change to 'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Marovitz	Poll absentees
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	Change to 'no'
170		Speaker Lechowicz	86 'ayes', 85 'noes'
	6:20	Schlickman	Verification
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tipsword	Vote 'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	90 'ayes', 81 'noes'
		Margalus	Change to 'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Withdraws request
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #29 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #30
		Speaker Lechowicz	
171		Barnes, E.M.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		McClain	Point of order
172		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes, E.M.	Continues



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Huskey	Questions germaneness
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment is germane
173-174-175		(Geo-Karis ((Barnes	Yield
		Speaker Lechowicz	
176-181		(Jaffe ((Barnes	
182		Speaker Redmond	In the Chair
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	Roll Call
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
183	6:45	Barnes	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
184		Satterthwaite	Voting 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #31
		Barnes	Withdraws Amendments #31-34
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #35
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	31.
185		Houlihan	Withdraw Amendment #35	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #36	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Barnes, E.M.	Withdraws Amendments #36-72	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Ryan		
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #73	
		McClain	Withdraw Amendment #73	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendments #74, 75, 76, 77	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Barnes	Withdraw	
		Speaker Redmond		
187		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #78	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McClain	Withdraw Amendments #78 & 79	
	7:00	Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #80	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Robinson	Proper form?	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevich		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lucco		
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
188		Mahar	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #80 - Passed
		Geo-Karis	Leave to table Amendment #92
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Peters	Table 81 & 82
189		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Houlihan	Withdraw Amendment #81
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #82
		Speaker Redmond	Peters withdraws #82
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #83
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Withdraws Amendment #83
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #84
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Withdraws Amendment #84
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #85
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	Withdraws Amendment #85
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #86
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #87
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #88
190		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #89
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #90
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #91
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn - Amendment #92 withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #93
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #94
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	Withdrawn
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #95 withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #96
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #97
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #98
		Speaker Redmond	Withdrawn
		Clerk O'Brien	No further Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	
191		Peters	Amendment #13 withdrawn in error



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
192-193		(Kane ((Peters Speaker Redmond	
194	7:13	(Kane ((Peters Speaker Redmond	Amendment #13 - Passed
195		Matijevich Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Matijevich Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond	HB 3148, 2nd Reading HB 3383, 2nd Reading TOOR HB 3385, 2nd Reading
196		Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Kane Speaker Redmond (Byers ((Kane Speaker Redmond	Amendment #16 Yield
197		Totten Speaker Redmond Matijevich	Inquiry



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	7:20	Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
198		Hanahan	
		Speaker Redmond	
199		McClain	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Neff	
		Speaker Redmond	
200		Garmisa	
		Speaker Redmond	
201		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Adams	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Explains 'no' vote
202		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #16 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #17
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Redmond	
203		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	
204	7:30	Hanahan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #17 fails
205		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #18
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #18 - Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #19
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
206		Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	Yield to DiPrima
		Speaker Redmond	
		DiPrima	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	To close
	7:42	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #19 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #20
		Speaker Redmond	
207		Kane	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
208		Hanahan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
209		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
210		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wikoff	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
211		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #20 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #21
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:52	Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #21 - Passed
212		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #22



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	Questions germaneness of Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1 adopted in Committee
		Speaker Redmond	Motion out of order
		Kane	Amendment #22
		Speaker Redmond	
	DiPrim	DiPrima	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	To close
213		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #22 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #23
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
214		Deavers	Oppose
	7:56	Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Redmond	
215		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #23 fails
		Matijevich	TOOR - Announcement
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Announcement
	8:00	Madigan	Move to adjourn



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
216		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
		Speaker Redmond	House is adjourned

