

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

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Representative Geo-Karis is in the chambers and Representative Kosinski, father of Senator Kosinski is in his seat. Resolutions. Representative Giorgi. The Clerk suggested that maybe the taking of photograph was in lieu of the prayer, but I think he's wrong. We'll be led in prayer by the Clerk, Jack O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Let us pray. Lord, bless this House and all those that serve and work here. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you write that out for me sometime, Jack? Representative Giorgi, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 381, DiPrima. 382, Lucco. 383, Richmond. 385, Reed. 386, Stanley. 387, Boucek. 389, Kelly. 390, Mulcahey. 391, Satterthwaite. 392, Molloy. 393, Dawson. 394, Dawson. 395, Jim Houlihan. 396, Redmond. 397, Kornowicz. 399, Mahar. 401, Jane Barnes. 402, Matejek. 383 is removed from the Consent..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 381 by DiPrima calls the attention of the Body to Donald K. Muntz from his Editors' Choice. 382 by Lucco shows the esteemed Dr. Henry D. Karandjeff of Granite City for 60 years of dedicated work. 385 by Reed honors Harry Thomas who lives in 'Taralife' in Warren Township. 386 by Stanley notes the 40th wedding anniversary of John and Mary Zimmerli. 387 by Boucek recognizes the accomplishments of Zlatko Trifunouski of Palos Hills. 389 by Kelly calls the attention to Leonard Presta, 50th wedding anniversary. 390 by Mulcahey extolls the Route 2 scenic drive along Rock River. 391 by Satterthwaite acknowledges James Todd Greenburg of Danville who's been her administrative aid. 392 by Molloy appreciates the work Harry Thomas Keefe of Oak Park has accomplished. 393 by Dawson applauds Eli Konjevich, President of the Southeast Lions Civic Club. 394 by Dawson shows



a regard to Mr. John Judge, is held by the Eastside Lions Club. 395 by Houlihan eulogizes Richard J. Walsh for his work in the Department of Labor. 396 by Redmond notes the achievement of John F. Sharp in becoming the father of a baby boy all by himself. 397 by Kornowicz extolls Mr. and Mrs. Stanley Lech on their golden wedding anniversary. 399 by Mahar denotes the Village Olympia Fields is celebrating its 50th year of progress. 401 by Jane Barnes recognizes the retirement of Mario 'Jack' Sansone of Chicago. And 402 by Matejek notes the festive polka festival in his district or in Milwaukee rather. And all these noted, outstanding accomplishments, I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries, the Resolutions are adopted. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment 2 and 3 to House Bill 611. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment 1 to House Bill 1064. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment 4 to House Bill 2402. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House that the Senate refused to recede from Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1769. Further directed to inform the House the



Senate requests the First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment to Senate Bill 735. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to Senate Bill 345. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to Senate Bill 327. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be at ease till ten o'clock. Do you have some announcements?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Announcements of Conference Committees that will meet in Room 400 at the following times, the first starting at ten o'clock a.m. this morning. Conference Committee related to House Bill 526 will meet this morning at ten o'clock in Room 400 at table 1. That's House Bill 526, ten o'clock, table 1. Conference Committee related to House Bill 659 meeting at ten o'clock this morning in Room 400 at table 4. House Bill 659, ten o'clock this morning, Room 400. Conference Committee related to House Bill 840 this morning at 10:30 a.m., Room 400, table 1. That was House Bill 840, 10:30 a.m. this morning, table 1, Room 400. Conference Committee related to House Bill 841 at 10:30 this morning, Room 400, table 4. That was House Bill 841, 10:30 this morning, Room 400, table 4. Conference Committee related to House Bill 845 at eleven o'clock this morning, Room 400, table 1. Repeating, House Bill 845, eleven o'clock a.m. this morning, Room 400, table 1. A Conference Committee related to House Bill 908 at eleven o'clock this morning, Room 400, table 4. Repeating, House Bill 908, eleven o'clock this morning, Room 400, table 4. Conference Committee related to House Bill 1109, eleven thirty o'clock this morning,



Room 400, table 1. Repeating, House Bill 1109 meeting at eleven thirty this morning, Room 400, table 1. Conference Committee related to House Bill 1216 at eleven thirty this morning, Room 400, table 4. Repeating, House Bill 1216, eleven thirty a.m., Room 400, table 4. No further announcements."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from South Bend, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I just wondered, is the voting up there indicative of what's going to happen today?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, those of you that are familiar with computers you know that there's an entry known as a constant. We've entered a constant up on the board. The Senate has suggested that the Senate will come in at twelve o'clock noon and suggested that we also do the same thing to give the rest of the morning... Conference Committees a chance to meet and hopefully, they'll be through. We will be at ease until twelve o'clock. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of Amendments to the following Bills: Senate Bills 892, 878, 803, 797, 779, 791, 762, 743, 687, 686, 673, 653, 607, 594, 589, 574, 573, 569, 321, 478, 466, 331, 330, 126, 935, 944, 952, 961, 965, 1028, 1035, 1036, 1041, 1063, 1068, 1092, 1098, 1102, 1121, 1149, 1201, 1148, 329 and 323. Concurred in by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 44. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests First Conference Committee. I'm directed to inform the House the Senate refused to recede from Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 1594. I'm further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee. I'm directed to inform the House the Senate refused to recede from Amendment 1 to House Bill 933. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee."



I'm directed to inform the House the Senate refused to recede from Amendment 1 to House Bill 1105. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee. I'm directed to inform the House the Senate refused to recede from Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 52. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee. Directed to inform the House the Senate refused to recede from Amendment 1 to House Bill 1406. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee. Directed to inform the House that the Senate refused to recede from Amendment 1 to House Bill 733. Action taken by the Senate June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. The Members please be in their seats. Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

I'm correcting the reading on this message. I read it incorrectly a while ago. I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has receded from their Amendment #1 to House Bill 733. Action taken by the Senate June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 254 and further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1508. Further directed to inform the House the Senate requests the First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has receded from their Amendment #1 to House Bill 1768. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House the Senate has receded



from their Amendment #1 to House Bill 1729. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has receded from their Amendment #3 to House Bill 910. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Conference Committee announcements."

Clerk O'Brien: "The following Representatives have individual announcements that are not at their desks to receive them. Representative Kelly has a meeting on House Bill 822 at twelve o'clock noon in Room 212, table 7. That's Representative Kelly on House Bill 822 at twelve noon. Representative Steczo on House Bill 822 at twelve noon, Room 212. Representative Steczo on House Bill 820 at twelve noon. Representative Hudson relating to House Bill 820, twelve noon, Room 212. That's Representative Hudson, House Bill 820, twelve noon, Room 212. Representative Christensen on House Bill 1038 at twelve noon, Room 400, table 1. Representative Christensen, Conference Committee relating to House Bill 1038 at twelve noon, Room 400. Representative J.D. Jones, Conference Committee on House Bill 1038 at twelve noon, Room 400. That's Representative J.D. Jones, House Bill 1038 at twelve o'clock noon, Room 400. No further announcements."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is my distinct pleasure to introduce to the House here, the Members, State Representative Marion Karenz from the State of Missouri. The only thing wrong with her, she's a Republican."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If I can take a brief few minutes to clear up the Calendar in the Appropriations Committee, I have a number of Bills of which I have notified the Sponsors of. These Bills were incorporated in the Omnibus Bill and I will read the numbers off very slowly. House Bill 483 which is Representative Edgar's Commission on Administrative Procedures. House Bill 556, Representative McClain, expenses of Commission to Reorganization of State Government.



House Bill 580, Representative Peters, for the Council on Nutrition. House Bill 648, the appropriation for the Illinois Commission on Atomic Energy. House Bill 754, the appropriation for the ordinary and contingency expense of Legislative Advisory Committee. House Bill 1597, Representative Geo-Karis, the appropriation for the Energy Resources Commission. House Bill 1602, Representative Barnes, the Commission on the Status of Minorities. House Bill 1634, Representative Caldwell, Commission on Public Utilities. House Bill 2174, Representative Macdonald, Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. House Bill 2380, Representative Mugalian, on the Commission on Mental Health and V.D. House Bill 2390, Representative Catania, on the Commission on the Status of Women. All of those Bills, Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to now table."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's motion? The question's on the motion to table the Bills enumerated by Representative Barnes. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Bills are tabled. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 752. Roll Call for attendance. That's right. Representative Madigan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The record will so show. Representative McAvooy excused for illness on the Republican side? No objection, the record will so indicate. Representative Lechowicz on 752. Wait a minute, Conference Committee notices first, Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Conference Committee notice for Representative Chapman on House Bill 1102, will meet at twelve thirty in Room 400. Representative Von Boeckman, you're on a Conference Committee on House Bill 797, will meet at twelve thirty in Room 212. Representative Giglio, Conference Committee on House Bill 979, twelve thirty in Room 212. Representative Sharp, Conference Committee on House Bill 979 at twelve thirty, Room 212. Representative Neff, Conference Committee on House Bill 979 at twelve thirty in Room 212. Senate Bill 752. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation.



to the ordinary and contingent expense of the various Boards, Commissions of state government. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. 752, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 752 is the Omnibus Appropriation Bill. The fiscal '78 request was in general revenue funds of two million, five hundred, seventy-eight thousand, five hundred dollars. The House Committee action brought up general revenue funds to two million, nine hundred and three thousand, four hundred dollars. Road Fund for five hundred and sixty-eight thousand dollars, for a total of three million, four hundred and seventy-one thousand dollars. Now, then you've got to go with the House floor action... anticipating Representative Schlickman's questions, G.R.F. now calls for five million dollars; Road Fund of five hundred and sixty-eight thousand dollars. The... I'm sorry, that's the County Appellate's Fund, five hundred and sixty-eight thousand. The Road Fund is ninety-four thousand; Metropolitan Current Exposition Reconstruction Fund for two million five hundred thousand. A grand total of all funds - eight million, one hundred and sixty-nine thousand, six hundred dollars. Be more than happy to answer any questions on any of the items within Senate Bill 752 at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "Within Senate Bill 752 is there still that infamous Amendment that would appropriate one hundred thousand dollars from the General Revenue Fund for reimbursement to Legislators involved in election contests or who have been indicted or have been involved in judicial proceedings?"

Lechowicz: "I don't know if it was infamous or not, but I believe that was Amendment #43, which was adopted on the House floor. And might I point out to you that the hundred thousand dollars is not a direct appropriation. That money is available for the purposes as outlined within the Amendment and a Resolution would



have to be passed by this Body in order to expend that type of money for the purpose you stated."

Schlickman: "So that this Bill does contain that Amendment setting up a fund with the sum of one hundred thousand dollars for reimbursement to Legislators involved in election contests or who otherwise are involved in judicial proceedings."

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. I've told you that was Amendment #43 and if you'd like, I'll read you the Amendment. 'The sum of a hundred thousand dollars or so much thereof as may be necessary as appropriated by the House of Representatives for payment or reimbursement for legal fees and expenses previously incurred by the House, by Members of the House and by parties to election contests and qualification challenges in connection with judicial or legislative proceedings relating to official conduct of duties as authorized by the rules of the House or by Resolution.' And I think that should take care of any, any concern that you have, Mr. Schlickman, because this Body would have to adopt a Resolution for repayment of any type of an action as contained by Amendment #43."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that Senate Bill 752 pass. Those in favor... the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Speaker, this is the Omnibus Bill as we all know and as has been pointed out, the one hundred thousand dollars is included in this. I suspect that your names will be in headlines if you vote for this Bill. But there are other reasons also for not voting for it and that, of course, is the two and a half million dollars that goes to the City of Chicago for McCormick Place from the cigarette tax that we... the state absolutely has no obligation to pay. It is blackmail, some say, but it's immoral. It's not right, we should not give it to them. We are giving them in this Bill also four and a half million dollars for four more years and I submit to you that that is absolutely not the right thing.



to do and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you what you're doing is listening to Scrooge on the other side of the aisle. This is Christmas, this Bill has something for everybody. And how any of us on such a festive occasion could be opposed to such things as Christmas and this Christmas tree, I just simply don't understand. And I say to all those Scrooges who don't want to be benevolent and who don't want to see the children have all of their little presents and have a good time, I say Bah, humbug. I would like to vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I'd like to join Representative Ewell in saying Bah, humbug. I think the Amendment that was put on providing for legal fees for Members of the Legislature is a terrible precedent for us to set. I believe that the Legislature should not pay legal fees not only in the broad cases described in that Amendment, but even for challenges that come before the Legislature. We have a situation in this state where we are known now as a hard-line Legislature on crime. And yet the people in our districts, they have to pay for their lawyers. No one pays for them and yet, here we're having public aid for Legislators. I think that it's the people in our communities that need the help. I think we'll have a hard time explaining to our people why we have private enterprise for the people in our districts and socialism for Legislators. I think that this is a bad Bill. We ought to send it back to Conference and we ought to defeat it and send it to Conference ultimately and have that Amendment taken out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, I think there's some merit in everything that's been said, but I think we're in the box right now of needing to send this back over to the Senate. Hopefully, they will not concur in some of these Amendments. But there are a lot of very important things in this Bill also including the Legislative Reference Bureau and some other agencies which are necessary to the function of state government. So I really think, even though I'm



not in favor of the Amendments being talked about, it's my suggestion we send it back to the Senate and hopefully they will not concur in that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are into our last day here. We've all been through this before. We know this Bill will go back to the Senate. We know that they have to concur on everything that we did here. We know that it will eventually go to Conference, so there's no sense in prolonging this here in the House. Let's give this Bill the necessary votes to get it into the process. That's all we're talking about here. Everyone that's making the... making all of the high and pious speeches about what will be read from this Bill and what will be read from this Roll Call, know that that's just a lot of bunk. Let's get this Bill in the process, get it back over to the Senate so it can go into Conference so we can resolve our differences here and get out of here at midnight tonight like everyone in the state wants us to do. Give this Bill the necessary votes so it can go back to the Senate so we can get it in the process to resolve any differences therein."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Pardon me, pardon me, back up. On this question there's 90 'aye' and 55 'no'. Representative Walsh has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Lechowicz requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Madison. Record Representative Madison as 'aye'. Emil Jones 'aye'. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'yes' to 'present' please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'present'."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson, Gaines, Kornowicz, Peggy Smith Martin, McAvoy, McMaster, Mugalian, Schoeberlein."

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

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I was away from my desk. I didn't have an opportunity to vote. They just polled me on the absentees and I



would like to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative McMaster as 'no'. Representative Gene Hoffman has requested that he be changed from 'no' to 'present'. Representative McAuliffe 'aye'. Representative Jane Barnes 'aye'. Have you completed the poll of the absentees? Now verify the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Please change my vote to 'present' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'. John Dunn.

Tipsword 'present'. John Dunn."

J. Dunn: "Change my vote to 'present' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Present. Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Hall: "E.M. Barnes, Jane Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Jane Barnes requested to be recorded as 'aye'. Oh, pardon me. Go ahead."

Clerk Hall: "Bartulis, Beatty, Bennett, Birchler, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Raise your hand when your name is called please."

Clerk Hall: "Chapman, Christensen."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you raise your hand please?"

Clerk Hall: "Corneal Davis, Dawson, Deavers, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Epton, Farley, Flinn, Friedrich, Garmisa, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Huskey, Jacobs, Jaffe, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Madison, Marovitz, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McAuliffe, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Molloy, Mudd, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Schisler, Sevcik, Shumpert, Stearney, Taylor, Terzich, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Wall, Wikoff, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi desires to be verified. He's on a Conference Committee. Questions of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bartulis."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis on the floor? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Christensen desires to be verified. Is that correct, Representative Christensen? He has to go to a Committee Report, Conference Committee."

Walsh: "Yeah, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we will excuse anyone. But for that reason only. Byers."

Speaker Redmond: "Byers on the floor? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Walsh: "Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Walsh: "Deavers."

Speaker Redmond: "Deavers. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Dawson has returned. Put him back on."

Walsh: "Dunn please. Ralph Dunn. Yes, Ralph Dunn is here, Mr. Speaker. Representative Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn is here. Doyle is here."

Walsh: "I'm sorry. Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Garmisa here? I see Waddell, is that Garmisa there? No. How's he recorded? Remove him."

Walsh: "Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "He was verified. He was authorized to go to Committee."

Walsh: "Jacobs."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jacobs. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Garmisa has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call."

Walsh: "Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."



Walsh: "Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Walsh: "Luft."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Walsh: "Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Marovitz on the floor? How's he recorded? Oh,
here he's..."

Walsh: "Is he here, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he is. Raise your hand, stand up."

Walsh: "Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Mautino. He's here."

Walsh: "McClain."

Speaker Redmond: "McClain is here."

Walsh: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Walsh: "Murphy."

Speaker Redmond: "Murphy here? Where's Murphy?"

Walsh: "Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute."

Walsh: "Have you removed Mr. Murphy?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is Mr. Murphy here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Capparelli here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Walsh: "O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien here? He's down in front."

Walsh: "Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Walsh: "Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler's in the back."

Walsh: "Sevcik."



Speaker Redmond: "Sevcik. Back there."

Walsh: "Shumpert."

Speaker Redmond: "Shumpert is here."

Walsh: "Taylor."

Speaker Redmond: "Taylor. He's here."

Walsh: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Redmond: "Van Duyne. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Walsh: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "How's Von Boeckman recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Walsh: "Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey. How is he recorded? Capparelli is back, put him back on the Roll Call. Huskey... what was the last one?"

Walsh: "Huskey."

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Jacobs. Put him back on. Representative Leverenz. Put him back on."

Clerk Hall: "He's back on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczko votes 'aye'. Von Boeckman is back on, put him back on. Representative Van Duyne has returned. Put him back on. What's the count? On this question there's 87 'aye'... how many 'no'? 55 'no'. Representative Stiehl, for what purpose do you rise? Stiehl. Mrs... Representative Stiehl, will you.."

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'aye'?"

Walsh: "Not now, Mr. Speaker. It's a little late for that."

Speaker Redmond: "I haven't announced it."

Walsh: "You certainly have."



Speaker Redmond: "I have not."

Walsh: "You absolutely have."

Speaker Redmond: "No, I haven't. Representative Stiehl be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Kent."

Kent: "Please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Willer."

Willer: "Change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer to 'aye'. Any others? Representative Jack Davis 'aye'. Representative Mahar 'aye'. What's the count now? Representative Byers 'present'. Byers 'present'. What's the count now? Representative Murphy is back, put him back on the Roll Call. On this question there's 92 'aye', 93 'aye', 55 'no'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Nonconurrence, 926. Representative Edgar. Representative Rigney, will you please sit down? Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, 926... we put two... we put an Amendment on in the House and went to the Senate. The Senate failed to concur but sent it back... We have now reached agreement with Senator Rock who had objection that we're going to put it in Conference Committee and accept the House Amendment. So I'd move to nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 926. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if I am to understand correctly the Gentleman cannot move to nonconcur. He can move to refuse to recede."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess, I think you're right. The Gentleman moves that we refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 926. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried, and the House refuses to recede. On Concurrence appears House Bill 1222. Representative Dan Houlihan is recognized."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1222. The Amendment



increased the number of additional Judges for the Circuit Court of Cook County beyond what this House had approved in the Bill. And I ask that we nonconcur and that this be placed into a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1222. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried, and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1222. Representative Bradley, will you answer your phone."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, arise?"

Schlickman: "Could we go to the order of sports momentarily? I would like to advise the House, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that yes, the Cubs did lose last night but it was deliberate. And the intention was to show to the world that the Cubs don't walk on water, they are human. And at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Representative Steczo to further evidence that while the Cubs lose, they still gain."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Cubs lost yesterday, coupled with the Philadelphia loss at New York, proves that there was some joy in Muddville last night and the magic number now has been reduced to 84. And there are some of us who are Cubs fans who feel that it was best to lose last night to Montreal so we could go to St. Louis this weekend and win four in a row. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Does Representative Barnes wish to respond? No? All right. Well, let's get down to business then. On the Calendar on the Order of Concurrences, does anybody have any motions to nonconcur that have to go to Conference on the Calendar under Concurrences? All right then, on the Order of Nonconcurrences. We'll pick the concurrences up but let's get... On the Calendar on page 3 of Nonconcurrency, Senate Bill 116. Mr. Terzich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 322, Mr. Abramson. Mr. Abramson on the floor? Senate Bill 322."



Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House not recede from Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 and that a Conference Committee be assigned."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to... not to recede from Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 322 and request a Conference Committee. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. And the Gentleman's motion carries. Senate Bill 327. Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move that the House do not recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 6 to Senate Bill 327 and I would ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to... that he... to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 6 to Senate Bill 327. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments to 327."

McMaster: "Conference Committee, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, did you ask for a Conference Committee... please."

Speaker Bradley: "That's automatic. I understand there will be a Conference Committee. On Senate Bill 345, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 345 the... we'd like to put this in a Conference Committee so that we can put the Bill back in its original form as one of the Amendments. That's what the Sponsor, Senator Buzbee, would like. And so I would... let's see, move to not recede from the House Amendment and then eventually we'll have a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ebbesen, did you refuse to recede?"

Ebbesen: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "...from Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 345. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion to refuse to recede from Senate Amendment or House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 345 prevails. 735, Mr. Kempiners. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Senate has refused to concur



in House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 735. I would move that we do not recede and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 735 and requests a Conference Committee be appointed. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and The Gentleman's motion prevails. 937, Mr. Kane. Out of the record? 1040 out of the record. Mr. McPike on 1203. On the Order of Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 1203. Do you wish to make a motion on that? Out of the record?"

McPike: "No, we're talking about that problem now. Out of the record."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record? House Bill 1208, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to request that we send this Bill to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Would you wish to refuse to recede from Amendment #1 and 2?"

Macdonald: "Yes, yes."

Speaker Bradley: "House Amendments to Senate Bill 1208. The Lady so moves. All in favor of the Lady's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the House refuses to recede from Senate... House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1208 and request a Conference Committee and the Lady's motion prevails."

Macdonald: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "And Senate Bill 1281. Mr. Hoffman on the floor? Take it out of the record. There's been a request to shoot some film, some T.V. film and we'll... also some other cameramen have requested an opportunity to take some pictures, so get your ties straight and we'll turn the cameras on for... T.V. lights for five or ten minutes. That's all. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, rise?"

Conti: "Been away from my desk, I see I'm on a Conference Committee, House Bill 933. There's no time on it. They're not meeting now are they?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, the time should be coming along on your smaller sheet, Mr. Conti, such as I have in my hand right here. A couple of announcements on Conferences."



Clerk O'Brien: "There's a notice here for you for Conference Committees relating to House Bill 2089 at one thirty p.m. in Room 212 for Representative Pierce. Representative Leverenz, you have a Conference Committee on House Bill 1001 at one p.m. in Room 212. Representative Greiman, you have a Conference Committee on House Bill 1001 at one p.m. in Room 212. Representative Sharp, you have a Conference Committee on House Bill 979 at twelve thirty in Room 212. Representative Huskey, you have a Conference Committee on House Bill 1182 at one p.m. in Room 400."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the form of an announcement, the Conference Committee for House Bill 1001 was held at the first notice of four o'clock yesterday. There was a second notice for four thirty. We now have another notice for one o'clock today. The computer printout does show that the Conference Committee has filed its report and there is no need for a one o'clock meeting for Representatives Greiman, Capparelli, Epton, me and I believe one other. So we will not be meeting one o'clock."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, on the Calendar, Senate Bill 1203. Mr. McPike, the Gentleman from Madison."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to refuse to rescind from House Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1203. And a Conference Committee will be appointed and all in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mann: "To make an announcement, Mr. Speaker. We've already resolved the Conference Committee on 2089. So if you have a notice on it, why, just ignore it."

Speaker Bradley: "On page 4 on the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 168. Mr. Griesheimer, the Gentleman from Lake. Take it out of the record. House Bill 659, Mr. Terzich. House Bill 822, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to



move to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 822. What this Conference Committee Report does which is different from the earlier Amendments which we had rejected, it... this pertains to legislation, pertains to allowing municipalities to deliver, not to sell, alcoholic beverages in their facilities. This would allow volunteer fire departments, nonprofit organizations and so forth to use the municipal property for parties or events in some towns that are small, a wedding or what have you. The facility could be used for that also. Now, on the Conference Committee Report, we deleted dram shop liability which was Senate Amendment #2. The reason being that in the Bill itself in the last portion, there is a specific section, under Section 11, line 17 through 20 which does include dram shop liability and therefore, we are deleting this. This Bill also includes ballrooms in state universities as another type of a facility that could, in fact, use the facility for the delivery of alcohol. Also, park districts... I'll bring this in... are also included in this proposal that can use these facilities for renting out or for allowing individuals to use their... And I would move for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 822. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like Representative Kelly to expand a little bit about this, what appears to me to be step one when you get into the... you say the ballrooms at state universities which is usually the university center. Now, you're talking about it being delivered or dispensed unless... let's assume that there's going to be a function that includes dancing and what you're saying is that included in the cost of that ticket could possibly be the cost of really not only dispensing, but it also could be interpreted to mean the sale of alcoholic beverages on university campuses. Is that correct?"

Kelly: "Representative Ebbesen, this ballroom at state universities, there's only one ballroom at one state university that, in fact,



has a ballroom. This is down in Senator Vadalabene's district and the... they have what is a ballroom. And this is the only one to my knowledge in the state. Can tickets be sold? Yes, I would say that tickets, by saying the tickets can be... by deleting the word delivered and saying that it can be delivered or dispensed into the facilities, I would say, yes, tickets could be sold and I don't care whether it's a volunteer fire department as I mentioned or a wedding or something. I'll have to say, yes, they can be sold."

Ebbesen: "Well, then also when you say there's only one ballroom at any given institution of higher learning, I'd have to challenge that. Is there a definition of a ballroom within the legislation?"

Kelly: "No."

Ebbesen: "Well, I would say anyplace that they're conducting, having a dance on campus you could call that a ballroom. This is pretty loose I would say and, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 822 for that reason, that one reason alone. I think we're opening a door here to what could lead to the universities going into the alcoholic, the sale of alcoholic beverages and I think that it's a bad precedent. It sounds to me like phase one and I think that we ought to have a Second Conference Committee and I would encourage everybody to vote 'no' on this First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Speaker and Ladies in the House, I don't have the same... I have the same concerns that Joe Ebbesen has, but for different reasons. Now, I'm not concerned about a state institution like a state college or a university, but this would put public pressure for every bar mitzvah, every christening, every wedding, every shower on four civic buildings that I have in my municipality that have a hall in it. And there would be a tremendous cost to the taxpayers and the public pressure that would be put on the elected officials in our school system with the four schools with auditoriums. We'd be holding weddings and all kinds of social



functions in a tax-owned piece of property. And I think this is setting a dangerous precedent and this is the last time to kill this Bill."

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

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Kelly, would you repeat again what you said with regard to the ballroom at S.I.U. and what you said about ballrooms in general?"

Kelly: "Yes, I indicated in this Conference Committee Report that ballrooms at state universities alcoholic liquor could be delivered and dispensed in ballrooms at state universities. And to my knowledge, there is one... and..."

Stuffle: "Well, to your knowledge there is one that dispenses or one ballroom?"

Kelly: "There is one ballroom at one state university that..."

Stuffle: "Currently that... well, I happen to know that Eastern Illinois University we have a rather massive ballroom and this could be, if alcoholic beverages were sold, dispensed or what have you there, this could entail thousands of people at one time. And there is indeed... there are indeed a number of ballrooms at state universities, university unions and it seems to me that this could put... could put universities and people selling tokens, what have you, for beer, wine, whatever, against the personages who happen to own and run businesses alongside the university community and I think this could have a debilitating effect on the business community. And have you had any... have you had any response from business communities with regard to this particular Amendment in the Conference Committee Report?"

Kelly: "No."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kelly, did you wish to respond? Was that a question? Evidently not. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I very reluctantly stand here to oppose my good friend, Dick Kelly, on a Bill like this, but this isn't the first time that I told him that I oppose it. I think for all the reasons



that were mentioned here already, in addition to the fact that it's putting the public sector here in competition with the private sector. You going to have the people who would normally have their bar mitzvahs and so forth that were mentioned here, you know, at the village hall. There is no provision in here either for any cleanup afterwards and I can see there'd be... you know, actually doing nothing but cleaning up the beer cans and all the garbage and dirt in the village hall, the park districts and so forth. I think it's a bad Bill and we should defeat it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Tuerk: "As I recall, we passed a Bill two or three years ago allowing certain beverages to be sold in a park district, for example, as long as there was food served along with the beer or what have you. Do you recall that?"

Kelly: "It... I recall something that had effect, Representative Tuerk. I don't remember all the details, but it seemed like in parks that... I don't know, that have food services, then it was permitted. So that is my recollection also."

Tuerk: "Well, how will this Conference Committee relate to the park district dispensing alcoholic beverages then? It seems to me that this opens it wide in any park district throughout the state."

Kelly: "Well, I think you're well aware of the financial plight of our park districts all over the State of Illinois. And this would be an excellent avenue for picking up a small amount of money that would help them to defer some of the costs. So I... there is also legislation that specifically was introduced during this Session for this special purpose also. So I'm very much in favor of allowing this park districts to help make up for some of these costs... the park districts in my area are all... they're all very depleted in their funds and they need some monies and this would help them very much."

Tuerk: "Well, if I could address the Conference Committee Report, Mr. Speaker. I feel that the park districts do have a financial plight,



one of the reasons why I supported the Amendment the other day to allow them to get some of the income tax revenues. However, I don't feel that this is the way to do it and I would join with the others who have spoken in opposition to this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As a Member of the Conference Committee and one of the drafters of the Report, we considered information from municipalities and from park districts that they did want this kind of legislation. I can't speak for the universities, but in answer to some of the people who opposed it, I'm sure that any kind of dispensation or delivering of alcoholic beverages in those buildings won't by any kind of an openended procedure. I'm sure that there'll be rules and regulations that'll be promulgated for an orderly dispensation and I would urge everybody to support Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise reluctantly to oppose this Conference Committee Report. I was a Member of the Conference Committee. I didn't sign it. Initially, I was a Cosponsor with my good friend, Mr. Kelly, and what we were trying to do, I think, was to allow the volunteer firemen to have a can of beer at the firehouse and that type of thing, but I think the Bill has kind of gotten out of hand. And if you look at the Conference Committee Report, you'll see that it says, 'May be delivered and dispensed in any building belonging to or under the control of any city, village or incorporated town.' Then we added in ballrooms. We've taken out the necessity for dram shop. There's some question in my mind as to who's going to pay for the dram shop insurance in this area. I think it's a vague area. There's also a question about whether it can really be sold or not. I don't think the initial intent of the Bill was to use it for profit although I know there were park districts in our area who had asked for the right to rent out their field houses to parties to sell booze in which they could get some money."



I agree with the previous speaker that this is probably the wrong way to help the park districts in their very serious need for more funds. I think it now has become a Bill that's a little bit unworkable and for that reason, I think we ought to reject the First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in opposition to this Conference Committee Report. What we're doing, we're opening up the universities to have legalization and sale of beer and wine on campuses. And if you approve this Conference Committee, this is going to be a step... your foot into the door in allowing this on the university campuses. I think this is wrong and I think we should send this back to a Conference Committee to work out a more equitable solution than allowing these alcoholic beverages to be sold at all these places and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Conference Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Deavers. Mr. Deavers."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to close."

Kelly: "Well, I'd just like to close by saying in response to the several mayors who had risen here that the Illinois Municipal League supported this Bill through the House and through the Senate. And maybe they're not always right, but certainly I think they are in this particular case and I... a lot of our earlier halls such as V.F.W.s and American Legion halls, they've become very, very old and dilapidated and you know that with this revenue sharing that's been made available, a lot of these cities in village halls are very attractive complexes that a lot of us would like to have parties, a lot of individuals. And I think it's a good proposal and I'd ask for your favorable concurrence with the adoption of this, move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 822. All those in favor of the



Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to explain my 'yes' vote on this. I think some of the remarks that were made in debate were not quite factual. The implication was that no beer or wine can now be served in any municipal building and any university buildings and I'd like to remind this General Assembly that right now in the faculty club in the University of Illinois, liquor... the sale and dispensation of liquor is permitted. And last Session I handled a Bill for the Village of Woodridge which had bought a golf course and they had a clubhouse on the golf course and they wanted the privilege of having open cash bars for different civic groups like the Kiwanis and Rotary Club and Lions Club and so on had their gatherings there. I think certainly this is the kind of Bill that all you veterans should support. If you're going to have, you know, use the public buildings, you certainly want to be able to serve beer or wine with the meals. And this just provides as I read it, for sufficient dram shop insurance coverage to protect the host and hostess, the host organizations. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to explain his vote."

Hart: "Thank you very much. I urge an 'aye' vote on this, too. We encroach in this area a little here, a little there. We had a Bill that the Sangamon County delegation sponsored to let them serve it at the airport and I see nothing wrong with this. The only objection I have to it, I want them to add in buildings under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. I think we ought to put an 'aye' vote on this and quit... and do it all at one time and get it over with."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the explanation of vote I would ask, like to ask a question. Maybe the Sponsor could answer under his explanation. I didn't get a chance to ask it. What does the word 'dispense' mean? Does that mean given out? Does it mean



sold in the context used in this Conference Committee Report?

What does it mean?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, to explain his vote."

Hudson: "Well, thank you..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to explain your vote, Sir."

Kelly: "Well, I'll answer that question that Representative Anderson raised. He asked about the word 'dispense', what does it mean? Well, the current law says it cannot be sold or delivered and by permitting it to be delivered or dispensed, I would assume you can mean it could be delivered, sold, handed out in any way possible. So what this would do, it would be very permissive by having the word 'dispense and delivered' included, you could do either."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think that Representative Kelly has been most forthright and honest in his answers to the questions relevant to the Bill. I, for one, did not go along with the original concept and along with Representative Mahar, did not add my signature to the Conference Report for all of the reasons that have been mentioned prior on this floor in opposition to the Conference Committee Report. Simply in good conscience, I feel that I should simply state that I, too, was in opposition to the Report and as a matter of fact, in opposition to the concept of the Bill. We are getting into the area of permitting the sale of alcoholic beverages in an ever-widening area of public domain. I think that this is precedent setting and something that we will have cause to regret if it goes too far. So I would urge a nonacceptance certainly of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think if you look at the original text of the Article being amended you will see that it retains the language, 'no alcoholic liquors shall be



sold in any building belonging to or under the control of the state or any political subdivision thereof.' The Conference Committee Report then goes on to add 'alcoholic liquors may be delivered or dispensed in any building under the control of the city, village', et cetera. And so it would seem to me that there is a clear distinction between selling and dispensing in these two sentences. I would interpret the Conference Committee language to mean that if a city or village or one of these other districts wanted to set up rules and regulations by which private parties could be held in those facilities, then the people holding the private party could arrange to have alcoholic beverages there not for sale, but as a part of what was served at that party. I think the Bill does retain a clear distinction between selling and dispensing and allows for the local governments to determine the rules and regulations under which they would rent their facilities for these purposes and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 67 'ayes' and 80 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Mr. Kelly, the Gentleman from Cook. Do you wish to request a Second Conference Committee?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to request that a Second Conference Committee be appointed for House Bill 822."

Speaker Bradley: "A Second Conference Committee request has been heard by Mr. Kelly and a Second Conference Committee on House Bill 822 shall be appointed. Mr. Griesheimer, on 168."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 168 went to Conference Committee. This is the Illinois Clean Air Act. It creates certain designated smoking areas in the State of Illinois. The Bill passed the House with very little trouble. Went over to the Senate where they added a home rule Amendment. In the Conference Committee, we discussed the ramifications and meaning of the home rule Amendment and whether it was necessary as the House had failed to concur on the Senate Amendment. It was recommended that the home rule Amendment be removed as it was not a limitation on home rule powers. The people on the Conference



Committee agreed that the home rule Amendment was not necessary and all Members of the Conference Committee, Senators and Representatives, agreed to remove the home rule Amendment. I would point out that the home rule Amendment was drafted, I understand, by Senator Daley and was sponsored by Senator Savickas, the Senate Sponsor of the Smoking Bill and they both agreed to remove the home rule Amendment. I feel that the Bill is in very good shape now, that we should agree with the Conference Committee Report at this time and vote affirmatively on this Bill and pass it on to the Governor's desk. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption, Mr. Griesheimer, of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 168. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 7 'nays' and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 168. 65... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, what purpose do you rise?"

Porter: "For a point of order. I'd like to compliment both Representative Kelly and Representative Griesheimer in presenting the Conference Committee Report. And I think that the Members who are going to present them in the future ought to use their presentation as an example. At this point in the Session, it's important that we know not only what Amendments have been acted upon by a Conference Committee, but exactly what shape the Bill is in. And I think every Members who's going to present a Conference Committee Report ought to present the entire substance of what we're voting on so we know exactly where we are."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point's well taken. House Bill 659, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 659 was changing the date of the Vietnam war that Representative DiPrima had some question about. The Conference Committee did adopt the change to leaving the date March 28, 1973 and inserting in lieu of March 7, 1975. It's all agreed upon and I move for concurrence of Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 659."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference



Committee Report #1. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I certainly hope that we do concur in this because if we don't we're never going to get the Vietnam War over with."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 659 indicate by voting 'aye' those in favor, those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 659. House Bill 979, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman. Don't see the Gentleman on the floor, take it out of the record. Mr. Leverenz. Mr. Von Boeckman on 979."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 979."

Speaker Bradley: "You move to adopt Conference Committee Report #1?"

Von Boeckman: "Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "#1 to House Bill 979. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, for what purpose..."

Leinenweber: "It had been suggested by Representative Porter, be helpful if we knew what..."

Speaker Bradley: "Point's well taken. Mr. Von Boeckman, it's been suggested that you explain the... those Members presenting a Conference Committee Report for adoption explain what the Conference Committee Report does."

Von Boeckman: "Well, we nonconcur because the Bill removed from a voters... from a driver's license record the accident report because it didn't indicate who's at fault and that Cook County was not submitting the reports to Secretary of State. But I've been informed by the Secretary of State that he is going to try to work this out and would like to have it removed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt Conference Committee #1 to House Bill 979. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', no 'nays', 6 voting 'present' and the House does adopt Conference Committee



Report #1 to House Bill 979. Mr. Leverenz on House Bill 1001."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Simply I'd move that we accept the... or adopt the Conference Committee Report. Briefly, the Senate Amendment that we have agreed to and wanted, the new language was not underlined as it should have been. In the Conference Committee we have the new language properly underlined and I move at this time to accept the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1001. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 156 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1001. House Bill 2355, Mr. Taylor. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House concur with Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2355. It was the one dealing with the Court of Claims and what it was is that the funds had to be... awards had to be paid out of different funds. I move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of... The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "As a matter of curiosity, who was the person in the Governor's Office of Manpower that had two hundred and fifty-four dollars and ninety-two cents from Chicago to Springfield? On page 2, the bottom of the page."

Taylor: "Would you repeat your question?"

Friedrich: "Yeah, on page 3, the bottom of the page, there's two hundred and fifty-four dollars and ninety-two cents for Ozark Airlines transporting somebody but it doesn't bother to say who the guy was."

Taylor: "Well, I don't have my Report right before me right now, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Somebody in the Office of Governor's Manpower which is rather interesting."



Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you take that out of the record for a moment please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record."

Friedrich: "No, that's all right. Not on my account."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 325, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have before us the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 325. Senate Bill 325 is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Court of Claims. What we had done in the House is we added two Amendments, Amendment #2 and #3. We are recommending in this Conference Report that we recede from those House Amendments and I'll explain why and what we've added back in. House Amendment #2 had added the name of the Court of Claims as the appropriating agency and that's an absolutely essential part of the legislation which we are putting back in and leaving in. Amendment #2 had also eliminated the Court of Claims Fund because House Bill 2355, I believe it was, over on Third Reading in the Senate was going to eliminate that fund. However, that legislation was not adopted so we are recommending that we put the Court of Claims Fund back in or rather leave it the way it is. The second House Amendment #2 provided for a salary increase for the secretaries and for the commissioners. It was felt on the part of the Members of the Conference Committee meeting that these increases were too substantial, so we have cut them back. The House Amendment that increased the salaries had increased them from fourteen thousand, eight hundred up to eighteen thousand, five. That was far too much, so we've cut the salaries of the commissioners by two thousand, five hundred down to sixteen thousand. With respect to these salary increase for the secretaries, we felt that that was modest enough, we left it the way it was. The secretaries salaries were increased from three thousand, five hundred to four thousand dollars which is just up five hundred dollars. That's what the Conference Committee



Report recommends and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 325. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 325. Back to House Bill 2355. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have answers to Mr. Friedrich's question and it was from the Federal funds and he understands the problem now. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit your support for Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2355. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 139 'ayes', 8 'nays' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2355. Senate Bill 332, Mr. Klosak."

Klosak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 332 the Senate has receded from its previous position and has adopted... has agreed to adopt House Amendments so that the Bill at the present time is in the exact shape it was when originally passed the House. I ask for your adoption and concurrence."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 332. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, to explain his vote."

Wolf: "Was a little fast there, I was wondering if we could get an explanation of this. How much money?"

Speaker Bradley: "You might ask that in explaining your vote. If Mr. Klosak wishes to reply in explaining his, it's the only way we can get to it. Mr. Klosak, do you wish to respond?"

Klosak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Wolf, I wish you paid more attention when I explained the Bill. The Bill is in identical shape



that it was when you voted for it just a couple days ago. It appropriates two million dollars, two million, one hundred thousand dollars for the expenses of the Racing Commission plus... and the four million for grants. Nothing has changed, Representative Wolf. Thank you for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 1 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 332. Senate Bill 337, Mr. McBroom, the Gentleman from Kankakee. Representative Ryan, could you move this? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on Conference Committee Report #1."

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

I move that we adopt Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 337. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'.

Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, can we get a response? Did the Conference Committee raise it, lower it, still the same? What's going on?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and... if you'll quit interrupting, I was on the Committee and I'll make a report, sit down. The items involved are these. There was a hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars for the financial institutions that was added in the House and taken out in the Senate. The Senate was adamant in their position and was finally compromised by reducing the amount by a hundred thousand dollars. The Department indicated that they were able to survive with this kind of figure. There was a second item for eighty-eight, eighty-one thousand, seven hundred, forty-three dollars. That had to do primarily with the efforts to recoup the money that the State of Illinois may become entitled to by reason of a statute that we adopted a couple of years ago that... cheats... deposits that have been inactive in state institutions of more than seven years. That is a potential windfall



to the state if vigorously pursued because many people leave their money idle and after seven years, the law is now that the banks must turn it over to the state. The state gives an eighty-five day notice that you can pick it up. If you don't, you lose it. That was diminished only five thousand, though the Senate had striven to have it diminished eighty-one thousand. All in all, the state agency felt that they could perform their function with this change. Accordingly, I move that we adopt the Conference Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "I repeat my question. I've listened to all the camouflage. Is the Conference Committee Report in terms of total dollars less or more than when it left the House and by how much?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, wish to respond?"

Cunningham: "It is one hundred and five thousand dollars less than it left the House and it is ninety-one thousand more than what the Senate wanted to pay."

Ebbesen: "And, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor... Spokesman there, how does it compare to last year?"

Cunningham: "It's about 3% higher than the last year's fund."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'ayes', 2 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. The House adopts Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 337. Senate Bill 339.. Mr. Mahar, the Gentleman from Cook."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 339. Senate Bill 339 is the regular appropriation for the emergency service and disaster area. In the Senate they reduced the appropriation by forty-one thousand, four hundred dollars. When it came over to the House, the House amended the money back in plus eighteen thousand, five hundred and forty-eight dollars more. The Conference Committee agreed that we add in the forty-one thousand, four hundred taken out by the Senate but leave off



the eighteen thousand, five forty-eight. So it's now exactly the way it was when it came out of the Bureau of the Budget. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 339. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 339. Senate Bill 543."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 543 which provided for the state contribution to the retirement systems for the various universities retirement system met in Conference Committee and we reduced the Bill as it came out of the House by six and a half million dollars. Actually, we split the difference between the Senate's version and ours and we increased the contribution to the three-state survey systems by some, approximately six hundred thousand dollars. So there's approximately a six million dollar reduction from when it came out of the House. I would ask for a favorable vote. This was unanimously agreed on by all members of the Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee #1 to Senate Bill 543. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman respond to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "Representative Wikoff, this Bill as the Conference Committee is recommending, is it a line item appropriation for the retirement system?"

Wikoff: "Yes, yes, it was... it is."

Lechowicz: "Now, is this a new approach? I believe last time this was used was about 1963. The entire Membership realized that we won't... will not have a lump sum appropriation responsible to the board and they concurred with the Senate changing of the appropriation system as far as the retirement, not only universities, but the other four retirement systems? This is the first



one that's been adopted and we've been holding back on two others because of... it's been the... as far as the difference in the line item appropriation."

Wikoff: "Yes, Ted, this was agreed upon..In fact, there was an earlier Bill put in which was... I don't have the number of it right now, which we adopted in the House and Senate and it's already on its way to the Governor which basically made these changes and provided for their contingent and operating funds. Prior to this year, at least in recent years, these retirement system contributions have always been a single line item from each one of the various universities. Now, they're still a separate line item, but they are still all within one particular Bill in appropriation now. This was the agreement and I don't know whether there was a concept or not, but it was agreement and recommendation of all of the university retirement systems and... to put it all into one fund rather than have a single line item within each university budget."

Lechowicz: "What is the rate of the retirement system for universities? Percentage rate."

Wikoff: "This came to the gross paid out. And what came out of here was the net plus two which will amount to somewhere around the neighborhood of thirteen million dollars. This is basically back in line with what the Board of Higher Education and with their recommendation on the thing."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may-be Representative Lechowicz... Representative Lechowicz, I'm a little confused. You said we were holding something that... in other words, what we're doing in this particular Bill we have a couple because we're not doing in other systems? Have we got something as far as these retirement systems that are not standardized by adopting this now? I didn't quite grasp what you said. Would you explain that a little bit further?"

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

Lechowicz: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, it's exactly what I pointed out



that on the state employees retirement system, that what they want to do is line item the entire appropriation on the retirement system. And before, it was a lump sum appropriation and the people that were responsible for it were the Board of Trustees for the retirement system were bonded. And in turn, that's their responsibility to make sure that the pay outs correspond to what's in the budget. And what we're doing here is we're going back to a system that was in state government prior to 1963 and I'm not saying it's good or bad, but it's a change in the policy of the retirement systems now the money's appropriated. And in all fairness, I thought this should be brought up on the House floor and the Membership would concur with the report or not to concur. I personally believe that it's a... you're putting the General Assembly in probably a better light as far as fiscal responsibility, but in all reality, the board itself may be... have their hands tied, they won't have the latitude that may be necessary in some of the retirement systems but it's a decision that should be made by the General Assembly and I thought they should be made aware of the fact of the change in the appropriation process." -

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd address myself to the legislation. Maybe we ought to have the Representative take this out of the record. If we've got... we'll have to talk about all four other systems, changing this in its entirety and I don't think we should have a Conference Committee Report that should be addressing itself at this particular area and maybe take it out of the record and get some standardization of where we're headed because what we do here would establish a precedent what we do in these other systems and I think that coming out of a ten-man Conference Committee and just say let's do it, I think it's more serious than that."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Joe, this has the appropriation for the Board of Governors, Board of Regents, Southern Illinois, University of Illinois, Illinois Community College Board, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Department of Registration, they're all in... are all inclusive in this for all of the university systems. This is



not just the University of Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, I'm not just talking about higher education. I'm just talking about systems in general and maybe I'm mistaken, but I'm a little confused on this and I think we're making a change that... going back to something from 1963 coming out of a Conference Committee. I think it has... you know, is more serious than that. And I'd appreciate it if you'd take it out of the record and let's talk about it."

Wikoff: "No problem."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. To answer the question of the Gentleman from DeKalb, this is a recommendation of the Board of Higher Education which was... which was a decision that was made among all of the various, various systems that are involved. This, what you have before you, is merely a compromise of an Amendment that was offered in the Appropriations Committee. This Bill came in recommended from the systems in the manner in which it is now. The Conference Committee Report is only addressing itself to an Amendment and the process that develops within our own appropriation system in terms of the manner in which this budget is set out and in terms of the manner of the line item. That was a recommendation of the Governor's office, of the Board of Higher Education and of the system itself. We should adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 543. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "I just wanted to know if the Sponsor would yield for one question."

Speaker Bradley: "Wikoff indicates that he'll yield to a question."

Wolf: "Representative Wikoff, I'm looking at the Conference Report and all these line items are increased. Could you just answer me, is this just to take care of immediate cash payouts for the coming year or is there anything created in an addition?"

Wikoff: "These will be the gross payouts which is a slight increase



over the immediate cash payouts. What came out of the Senate, the reason this is amended as an increase... I said, it's actually a decrease from what came out of the House and what came out of the House with a... House Committee with a unanimous vote and actually came out of the House 157 to 2, but we amended the Senate Bill which has been reduced by Senate action and that's the reason for all of the increases. I said that... right now, it's approximately six million dollars less than it originally... than it went out of the House."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, all of the institutions involved are agreed to the purposes that we have in this Bill. I have gone through the Conference Committee; the Board of Higher Education is in agreement; the Board of Governors; the Board of Regents; the University of Illinois; the Water Survey; everybody is in agreement what happens here. I don't understand what all this tumult this is all about."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 543. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Bradley 'aye'. Thank you. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 145 'ayes', 12 'nays' and the House does concur... does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 543. On the Calendar... on Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 116. Mr. Terzich. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bluthardt: "For an inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was promised most solemnly by the Speaker of the House who came to my desk that at eleven o'clock this morning those matters involving the challenge to the Breslin seating would be taken up. Was not taken up at eleven o'clock, he told me at twelve o'clock it would be taken up immediately after we got back in here at twelve o'clock. It is now two o'clock, Sir, and hasn't been heard yet."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bluthardt, the posture of the Chair, as I indicated to you a few minutes ago, that we would do these Conference Committee Reports, get these Nonconcurrences back so we could get a motion on those so we could go ahead and get the Conference Committees set if we need to and we're going to go to that order of business, Sir."

Bluthardt: "Sir, you said a few minutes ago. That was an hour ago, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I can't tell how long it's going to take on debate."

Bluthardt: "I was promised solemnly by the Speaker of the House that this matter would be heard and not heard on the eleventh hour. It would be heard at eleven o'clock this morning and then twelve o'clock, at noon."

Speaker Bradley: "It'll be heard after five more pieces of business are taken care of. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to take exception to what you're saying, but this is the kind of song and dance that we've been given on this issue from the beginning. Now, we were given a commitment as to a time which this would be called, not after how many pieces of legislation would be heard or not after what point on the Calendar we were. I think the Chair owes it to all..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. You've already told him what the Chair intends to do."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point's well taken. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich. I said that Mr. Houlihan's point was well taken."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, on Senate Bill 116."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House recede from Senate...or House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 116. The Bill was originally a revisionary type Bill which substitutes 'persons' for 'men.' in several Acts. Senate...House Amendment #1 provided for a referendum vote on some bonding and I would...my desire to recede from Senate...or House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 116."

Speaker Bradley: "Question? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this motion because this is receding from the Amendment that I put on. I want everybody in this House to know that this is not a personal fight between my good friend Bob Terzich and I but on two occasions previously this House adopted this Amendment #1, a 103 to 3 and 139 to 1. Now nobody on this House likes to lose. And I don't mind losing fairly and squarely. But I want to tell you one thing, in the years I've been here, I don't like devious methods and false arguments being used against my Amendments across the rotunda. And to tell you the truth this was done and it makes me madder than hell. I want to ask each and everyone of you to back me up in opposition to this receding from this Amendment because I don't think it was done fairly and one of the arguments that was used was this, effected another city. And all that the individual Senator had to do was call his Council of his Civic Center Authority and ask him whether it did. And every attorney that I've talked to said that this did not affect another city which I didn't intend to do. And I want to tell you people that it is important to me. I haven't asked much of this Session of the Legislature and I want to tell you that I'm representing the people of the City of Danville and I ask you to keep this on, to keep a referendum before they can sell their bonds. Thank you very much and vote 'no' on this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Representative Campbell is certainly correct. He is a good loser and he deserves to win this time. Republican Party in the City of Rockford lost control of the Court House because they...did things



out of referendum with their Public Building Commission. Now, Representative Campbell has been around long enough to know when the people in his district and his hometown want something and when they don't want it. And it just so happens the Mayor is wrong here and Representative Campbell is right and we certainly ought to be voting the same way he is."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 116. This is final action. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to recede vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, I...gee, I never knew that you made such a good poll... poll of the House, Chuck, but either here nor there that, you know, this again is...is my Bill, it's my desire to recede from this Amendment; that this is the only city that would be affected by a referendum vote. It's my understanding that these bonds and so on have been either issued or sold and that this will stop the progress that the people or the administration is proceeding with. Now it's being selective against one city in the entire State of Illinois and I don't think that's fair either. So, you know, if you're going to do what's good for the goose, it's good for the gander. And this isn't...why should we go to....to determine what should be done in one single city. Now if the Administration under their Leadership, they have to answer to their voters and I think we should let the Mayor and the City Administration run their own business and we should stay out of it. And therefore I would urge that some of you at least give a reconsideration on this and recede from House Amendment #2. A similar type situation was sent over to the Senate on a previous Bill which was defeated and I think we should do the same in the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 24 'ayes', 121 'noes'. And the Gentleman's motion fails. You wish a Second Conference Committee, Mr. Terzich, or what's your discretion, Sir?"

Terzich: "What's that? Oh, I...I move to table Senate Bill 116."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to table Senate Bill 116."



Mr. Terzich, I don't think that that is a proper motion."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, just hold it on Nonconcurrency please."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, we'll just hold it on Nonconcurrency."

On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 1209. Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1209 was a rather simple Bill which provided that the school districts who take their funds from the Strayer-Hague formula could use their money for any educational purpose. This is the same as those school districts who now get their money from the equalizer formula. And it was to even it up. I find no quarell with that. There are two Amendments on the Bill. The first Amendment would allow those school districts who have passed a referendum to use that added tax rate after one year to get into the equalizer formula. This would not cost the state additional money, but it would redistribute money in the formula. The second Amendment on the Bill is an Amendment which would allow those school districts for another year who have had a reduced assessed valuation caused partly from action of this General Assembly to an extended rate which would allow them to take in the same type of tax money they did the year before. This has been approved by the Conference Committee Report and I would think that we would probably want to have a division of the question and I would move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Representative Ewing, with regard to the new language in Section 17-802. It says that an amount may be produced in an amount of revenue which would have been produced had there not been a reduction in the equalized assessed value for a district based upon 990. It seems... is it the intention that the amount you would produce would be equal to the earlier amount?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Stuffle: "Okay, the second question. It appears that a backdoor



referendum is affixed to this increased levy. I don't see a place where there's any notice provision in the back... for the backdoor referendum. Could you cite one to me?"

Ewing: "No, I could not."

Stuffle: "Okay, could I speak to the Conference Report, Mr. Speaker?"

Mr. Speaker, could I then speak to the Conference Report?"

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir, proceed."

Stuffle: "Well, first of all, with reference to the allowance for an increased levy. The Bill doesn't define itself such as to state that if this is the hold harmless against the earlier amount of assessed valuation, it seems to me that the way the first paragraph of 17-802 is written, it could well be construed that an amount of revenue which would have been produced had there not been a reduction in the equalized assessed levels could be merely an estimate based upon the old level plus a percentage of increase that would have occurred had there not been the enactment of House Bill 990 rather than a mere hold harmless against the earlier rate. And as I understand what the Sponsor just said with regard to 17-802, there not only is only a backdoor referendum on this increased levy but also there's absolutely no notice to the taxpayers whatsoever that there's been an increase in the levy. And they only have ten days to respond even if there were a notice which there isn't. And for that reason, I could do nothing but urge the defeat of this Conference Report despite the other meritorious things that are in it."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Do you wish to respond, Sir?"

Ewing: "Well, I just want..."

Speaker Bradley: "You can close."

Ewing: "No, I'd like to correct the matter here. I am mistaken. There is a twenty-day notice after publication of the backdoor referendum and this was pointed out to me."

Speaker Bradley: "Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Well, this says notice of the election shall be given at least twenty days prior to the date of the election. I'm talking about and I'm reading from the corrected copy, I believe. I'm



talking about a notice that the tax has been levied so that the voters and the taxpayers can go out and collect the signatures for the backdoor referendum. I don't see any notice provision that the levy's been made. I only see a notice provision after the signatures have been acquired that there'll be a twenty day period before an election."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm not going to debate the issues other than just exactly what is on this Conference Report. And if you can find it among... on your desk, somewhere there's one of these pink copies that says Senate Bill 1209, Section 17-8., .02. 'Increase in maximum tax rates. Notwithstanding any provision in this Article, a district may increase any of the tax rates levied under this Article in order to produce an amount of revenue which would have been produced had their not been a reduction in the equalizer assessment level for the district as a result of the public Act.' It simply says and I've just read it to you, an increase in the maximum tax rates notwithstanding any other provision. I think you should sinc... seriously look at this pink sheet on 1209."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi." What's that, Mr. Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment... Senate Bill 1209 is also carrying the Bill that allows school districts that have had referendum in the past year and there are about thirty counties involved and that allows you to trigger in one year earlier because of the advancement of computers and the 'fast-dast' new mathematicians at the Board of Education... has hired. There's no reason to wait two years to trigger in your tax rate and your assessed valuation. This is a good Bill. It's passed this House, been heard by Committee and there's no tricks in the Bill. It's a very good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question... the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Representative Ewing, could you tell me... I'm not real sure



when you get these Conference Committee Reports what Sections. Would you mean that, let's say, a school system lost a significant amount of revenue because of us passing 990, could they then go over the statutory tax rate for school systems now without a referendum?"

Ewing: "They could go over it, but they would have...the provision for a backdoor referendum is included in this."

McClain: "So they could go over like for unit districts a dollar, sixty-five without a referendum and this would provide an opportunity for a backdoor referendum."

Ewing: "Right. This is the same measure that this House and this General Assembly has passed and it's been signed into law before for the first year after 990 was effective. And I don't think it... we found a runaway taxing situation in our school districts, but there are certain school districts who are very hard pressed by this and by action of this General Assembly. And this would help protect them to continue their programs."

McClain: "Okay now, so I'm clear on this, Tom. A school system could raise their tax rates over, let's say, the dollar, sixty-five, without a referendum unless there is significant amount of petitioners for a backdoor referendum in order to make up only what they lost in us passing House Bill 990. Yes or no?"

Ewing: "That's right."

McClain: "Okay, thank you."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Ewing, I find that there are two..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Satterthwaite, wait just a minute would you please. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, on a point of order."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are we dealing with the corrected copy?"

Speaker Bradley: "I hope so."

Totten: "Well, I point out under the rules that corrected copy must be on their desks for one hour and it was just distributed and I think we ought to wait till we could do that."



Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, this was the question I wanted to address.

In looking over the two copies, I cannot find any distinction between the original copy and the corrected copy."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, let's get the response from Mr. Ewing. Have you had a corrected copy made in place of the original?"

Ewing: "No, I have not. I don't know who has the corrected copy made."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Polk, can you shed some light on it?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I have the corrected copy."

Speaker Bradley: "When... who requested the corrected copy and when was it distributed?"

Ewing: "I really couldn't tell you. You'd have to ask the Clerk. I did not."

Speaker Bradley: "We'd better take this out. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mrs. Satterthwaite has the corrected copy in her hand and she has the original copy. There's only one word that was corrected. Why don't you refer to Mrs. Satterthwaite? Just one word was..."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I'm trying to... the point of order the Gentleman's made that the corrected copy has not been on the desks for one hour..."

Giorgi: "It has been on an hour, the corrected copy also."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would..."

Speaker Bradley: "It just came out. Let's take it out of the record."

Ewing: "Yes, I think that's a good idea."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Order of Nonconcurrences, Supplemental, appears Senate Bill 364, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 364 is the Appropriation Bill for the Department of Personnel. House Amendment #2 was attached in the House deleting two hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars from this budget which was the appropriation for the model employer program of the Department of Personnel. The Senate refused to concur with House Amendment #2 and so the Bill has come back to the House and I would now move that the House do recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 364."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House recede from:



Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 364. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Unless I missed it, I don't understand what we are receding from, what the Amendment did, what the issue is and why we're now..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I explained it. The Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 364 is the Amendment which deleted two hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars for the model employer department or program in the Department of Personnel. That Amendment was not concurred in by the Senate and so now we are moving to recede from the House Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "This is final action. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could the Sponsor take this out of the record for a second?"

Speaker Bradley: "Take that out of the record, Mr. Schuneman?"

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to take it. We've been holding this Bill trying to get it before this Body ever since yesterday."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I was confused and withdraw my request."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my understanding that we are receding from House Amendment #2?"

Speaker Bradley: "That's correct."

Totten: "And House Amendment #2 eliminated the model employer program for two hundred and sixty-six thousand. So if you agree that that should be reinstated, you would vote 'aye'. If you think it should be eliminated, you should vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? On this question there are 120... Clerk will take the record. 119 'ayes', 12 'nays' and the House does recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 364. For what purpose the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, arise? Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to have my 'present' vote



changed to 'aye' on Senate Bill 752?"

Speaker Bradley: "Was a verified Roll Call, I don't think we can do that. Mr. Barnes wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye' on Senate Bill 364. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 495. Mr. Telcser, on Nonconcurrency, Supplemental Calendar #1. What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats, arise?"

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought we'd established a policy where people would explain what were in these Bills. We're getting away from it. I would request you as the Chair not to call a vote on a Bill until we found out what's in it, particularly these appropriation Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "Point's well taken."

Keats: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, on Senate Bill 495."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Senate concurred in all of our Amendments except House Amendment #1 which included two projects for the Department of Conservation. The Department of Conservation, after discussing it with the Senate Members has agreed that they don't need the bond money for those two projects this year and I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, now move that the House do recede from Senate Amendment... from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 495 which would be final action."

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

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us which two legislative districts are going to get angry calls as a result of our receding from this Amendment. Which two projects are involved? 33rd and which other?"

Telcser: "I couldn't tell you the other one, Cal, if that is the one."

Skinner: "Is that one of them?"

Telcser: "Oh, Starved Rock and Castle Rock, my aid tells me."

Skinner: "That's all right."

Telcser: "Wherever that is and it's at least a hundred and seventy-seven thousand, eight hundred and sixty-one dollars."

Skinner: "You'll get no objection from me. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House recede from House



Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 495. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 6 'nays' and the House recedes from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 495.

Senate Bill 693, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

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

Senate Bill 693 was the legislation which allowed nonhome rule municipalities to pledge their full faith and credit as a backup for revenue bonds issued to pay for water, sewage and other utilities.

If you recall, Saturday we placed an Amendment on this going from a backdoor referendum to a front door referendum. The Senate Sponsor did not concur with that and then sent it back. I would recede, ask to recede... that we recede from Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "What was your motion, Mr. Darrow? To recede?"

Darrow: "To recede."

Speaker Bradley: "Recede from Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask Representative Darrow..."

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

McMaster: "...to explain what Amendment #2 is that he is receding from."

Darrow: "Amendment #2 was a front door referendum that we placed on a Bill dealing with nonhome rule municipalities. If we look at it to start with, the Senate Bill 693 was designed to save non-home rule municipalities money when they financed water, sewer, electrical and gas projects. They could save between ten and twenty percent in securing bonds and decreasing their borrowing costs. Now, when it came over here, we felt that we ought to have a front door referendum or some of us did. We placed the front door referendum on, it already had a backdoor referendum as I understand. Now, the Senate Sponsor wants us to take the front door referendum off and I'm agreeable with that and ask that we recede from that Amendment."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, may I talk on this?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir, Mr. McMaster, proceed."



McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I think everyone should be aware of what this Bill does. It would allow nonhome rule municipalities to back revenue bonds with the full faith and credit of the municipality. In other words, they have the G.O. obligation or the same as the G.O. obligation to fall back on which is the full faith and credit of a municipality or whoever is issuing the bonds. And I think that if we do take this front door referendum off, then I'm not sure that there's any referendum on. And then the municipality could levy a tax at any rate without referendum to keep a reserve fund that is provided for in this Bill at a special level. And I think it's very dangerous if we go to something in the way of bonding that starts out at revenue bonds, but if the revenue is not sufficient to pay off the bonds, then you have a right to levy a tax, full faith and credit tax, on the municipality involved to pay those bonds. And if we do this without a full referendum, I think that we're doing a very, very great disservice to the people of any municipality and I would certainly hope that we would not recede from the House Amendment and hopefully go to a Conference Committee and try to get this thing worked out and keep a referendum in there. Anytime we go to something that involves full faith and credit of the municipality or whoever is involved, I think it's very necessary that we have a referendum."

Speaker Bradley: "For an announcement, if Representative Pierce is within earshot of my voice, he is on a Conference Committee, House Bill 52 that's meeting at two thirty in Room 212, table 8. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I feel exactly as the last speaker does, Mr. Speaker, that this is a... this is something that we should not undertake to do. We... certainly I don't think should undertake to do it on a Conference Committee Report. This Bill was debated very vigorously. Yeah, well it's been pointed out to me that bonds issued in this way are not subject to debt limitations, but the fact is it was debated vigorously when this Bill was heard on Third Reading. It was postponed because it was defeated. The front door referendum was put on the Bill in order that the Bill might be passed. Now, I suggest to you that this House showed far



greater, better judgment than the Senate did because the Senate sent it over to us with a backdoor referendum. Now, the Senate again attempts to remove the front door referendum and insert the backdoor referendum. I wonder what affect, Mr. Speaker, this would have on the infamous skyway bonds, the bonds that are selling for about sixty cents on the dollar and are revenue bonds. I wonder if the County of Cook or if the City of Chicago could pledge their full faith and credit on these skyway bonds and bail out those... bail out those bond holders. This is a bad Conference Committee Report. It flies right in the face of what this House did a few days ago and I urge that you defeat it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yes, I did talk on this Bill when it was before the House. But I wanted to call its attention to Bill Walsh and it's very seldom I've disagreed with Tom McMaster on any of this legislation, especially when it comes to small governmental units. Bill, this refers to nonhome rule units so it wouldn't have anything to do with the skyway bonds in the City of Chicago. And you were my colleague that represented an area that benefited from a Bill just like this that we issued bonds, forty-year bonds, for a water system in Lyden Township and without... those bonds were not very saleable and we had trouble with them and that's why at that time I think all you could do is sell bonds at twenty years and we got bonds at forty years and the people... some eighteen thousand people in the unincorporated area now enjoy a water system where many communities a lot bigger in the northwest part of Cook County still doesn't have their own water system. So these small municipalities need it. If the rascals that are in office come in with an exorbitant expenditure, an unnecessary expenditure, again I say you don't need legislation to throw people out like that at the next election. So I agree with Clarence Darrow on this that we should recede."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I must disagree with the last speaker who happens to be my Committeeman back home. But it would seem



to me that if we were to put the full faith and credit behind revenue bonds and avoid a referendum that then we would have no reason to worry about whether or not the project would in reality bring about enough revenue to pay off the bonds and the debt service because it would have, it would be, in effect, a G.O. and the entire community would be obligated to pay a tax or pay that indebtedness off. So what we're saying is, yes, you can camouflage any project you want, call it a revenue bond issue, but in reality of the G.O. and it's done without a vote of the people, I think it's bad philosophy and I think we ought to defeat this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to oppose this motion to recede from the Amendment that removes the front door referendum. Such a motion, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is not in good faith inasmuch as this Bill would never, would never have been passed by the House without that Amendment. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, let's look at this Bill for what it is, not for the way it's described. Number one, as it was introduced, it did apply only to nonhome rule units. However, by the Amendment offered by the Sponsor it was expanded to apply to all municipalities within the State of Illinois whether by home rule or whether nonhome rules. It applies to the City of Chicago, it applies to the County of Cook, it applies to my own village, Arlington Heights. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill wasn't requested by the Village of Arlington Heights. I don't know if it was requested by the City of Chicago, but I do know that this Bill was caused to be introduced by the First National Bank of Chicago. Now, the First National Bank is interested in a profit. It's not interested in the people's will. It's not interested in whether or not a project is meritorious. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, by removing the referendum requirement, by having in this Bill no limitation on taxing authorities, by giving to the municipalities the authority to levy a tax if the revenue isn't sufficient to pay off the bonds; and, yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House,



by giving to the First National Bank of Chicago the legal right to go into court, if the bonds aren't being paid by revenue and to sue the municipality and to seek a court order requiring the municipality to levy a tax. All we're doing, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is subverting the Democratic process, removing from the voters the right to determine what kind of projects they're going to have, by removing the incentive on the part of units of local government to come up with healthy, viable projects, by eliminating the guarantee that it will be a worthwhile project and that it will produce revenue. All we're doing, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is giving a guarantee to the First National Bank of Chicago, to the bonding companies that regardless of the lack of merit of the project they'll buy the bonds because they'll know they'll be paid. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a bad, bad motion. I'm disappointed in the Sponsor for suggesting that we should recede from the Amendment and I encourage a 'no' vote."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I bothered to read all of the statutes referring to this particular Bill and I would like to quote to you from Chapter 24, 11-117-8 on bond issues. And it says, 'For the purpose of acquiring any public utility or any part thereof or a property necessary or appropriate for the operation of a public utility'. And that's what this things for... is for. Either by purchase, condemnation or construction, any municipality may borrow money and issue negotiable bonds therefore pledging the faith and credit of municipalities. But no such bonds shall be issued unless the proposition to issue bonds is first submitted to the electors of the municipality and approved by a majority of those voting thereon. Now, automatically there's a provision in the statute when the full faith and credit of a municipality backs them up even if they're called revenue bonds, there has to be a referendum. I contend in the other sections to which this Bill refers to, there is a backdoor referendum. Now, when you talk about the home rule municipalities, they already have that authority. However, the purpose of this Bill is to assist the units of local government



which are not home rule units to finance certain public works and utilities that reduce financing costs by allowing such units of local government to pledge their full faith and credit as additional security to certain revenue bonds in the issue. And I can tell you this, even though the intent of the Bill might be the backdoor referendum, as soon as the municipality pledges its full faith and credit, even if it calls it revenue bonds, no bonding company will issue an okay on it unless there is a referendum and I think the Bill is good and should pass."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to close."

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

I don't know how many times I have to explain to my colleague on the other side of the aisle who happened to go to the same college as I did, but evidently can't remember as well as he did in those days that this already applies to home rule jurisdiction. What we are trying to do is extend the same benefits to nonhome rule jurisdiction. Amendment #1 had nothing to do with home rule jurisdiction. Bloomington, Danville, Rosemont already have provisions such as this. Eighteen states have provisions such as this. What we have are guarantees built into this. We have the municipality levying charges to cover the principle interest on the bonds of a hundred by a hundred and ten percent. They have to have the money there ahead of time, a year ahead. There's very little chance whatsoever that they won't be able to meet this obligation. Now if you want to talk about the First National Bank of Chicago and get it all muddied and blurred, why don't you think about the downstate communities. This isn't necessarily a First National Bank Bill. This applies to downstate where you have the nonhome rule jurisdictions, where you have trouble now with E.P.A. and areas like that and they're coming in and saying you have to build new sewers. This is the way these little towns can finance these projects and save ten to twenty percent. I think we should recede from this as the Senate Sponsor requests. It's his Bill, he wants us to recede and I'll go along with him. I'd ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to... the shall recede from House



Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 693. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one effect of this Bill which I don't think anybody here has given much thought to is that if this power is given to local municipalities, it will effectively end the issuance of revenue bonds because there's no bank or no buyer of revenue bonds that's going to purchase a revenue bond if it isn't already, the municipality doesn't pledge its full faith and credit. So I think that if we're going to continue having revenue bonds of any kind whatsoever, we should vote 'no' on this... on this motion to recede."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 50 'ayes', 88 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Do you wish to make a substitute motion, Mr. Darrow?"

Darrow: "Go to Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman now moves that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 693 and requests a Conference Committee and it will be so done. On Senate Bills, on the Supplemental appears Senate Bill 830. Mr. Brady, the Gentleman from Cook."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I move to refuse to recede from the House Amendment #6 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede on Senate Amendment #... or House Amendment #6 to 830 and requests a Conference Committee. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion is adopted. All right, now if the... we want the floor cleared of everybody that's not entitled to the floor and we want the Pages in their seats and the Doorkeeper, everybody that's not entitled to the floor and that means only, we'd like to have only Members, we'd like to... the staff... The staff has imperative Conference Committee business, but there won't be any business on Conference Committees for a few minutes, so I see no purpose to them being on the floor. Everybody not entitled to the floor,



that includes legislative liaison and we'd like to have the Pages
in their proper places."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Bradley: "Page 6. On the Speaker's Table appears a Report of Election Contest. Doorkeeper, is everybody off the floor now that's not entitled to the floor? The Doorkeeper back there is pointing to somebody that's not entitled to the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Speaker's Table. Report of Election Contest, 35th Legislative District. Brinkmeier vs. Adams. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I present for adoption by the House the final report of the Elections Committee on the election contest for the 35th Legislative District. This contest as it's captioned, Brinkmeier vs. Adams, Rigney and Mulcahey. Former Representative Brinkmeier brought this contest to challenge the election principally of Representative Harold Adams. The Committee held several preliminary hearings ultimately sent the contest to a Subcommittee chaired by Representative Schisler to conduct a partial recount. The partial recount was agreed to by Mr. Brinkmeier and Representative Adams. The Subcommittee counted four precincts in Jo Daviess County and one precinct in Carroll County, two of which were counted in the County Courthouse in Galena and the remainder were counted here in Springfield. During the recount the House should note that Representative Taylor Pouncey showed courage and bravery above and beyond the call of duty. At the conclusion of a partial recount Mr. Brinkmeier withdrew his petition of contest based on a result of partial recount. This recount establishes the apparent and real discrepancies in the vote count. It would not effect the outcome and some of the apparent discrepancies were only impressions caused by the fact that a number of the voters had not voted for State Representative, although they had voted for other offices. The report recommends that the contest be dismissed and that Representatives Adams, Rigney and Mulcahey be confirmed in their elections and remain seated as duly elected Members of the House. I want to thank



the Members of the Subcommittee for their hard work and long hours in recounting the ballots. The recounted ballots were all paper and recounting paper ballots is an awful lot of hard work. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the report."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, as Minority Leader of the House Elections Committee, I wish to concur with the recommendation of the Chairman of that Committee. I think the Subcommittee worked hard, spent many hours, traveled many miles in very stormy, rainy weather and I think that it has come to the proper conclusion and I will join in the motion of the Chairman."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the report of the Election Committee. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 161 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Report is adopted. Representative Ewell, 'aye'. Representative Adams."

Adams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This has been a moment I've been waiting for, although with some regret. It's kind of nice to be a freshman and have your name on the roster every day and I'm going to feel a little disappointed if we go print another Calendar not to be able to be on the Calendar for every day. But regardless of that, it is a great honor to be able to be a Member of the 80th General Assembly and this will be one day in my life that I will not forget. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Speaker's Table. Report of qualifications challenge. Report on the qualification challenge of Representative Breslin. I thought I announced it. 161 'aye' and no 'nay' and the report is adopted. Representative Laurino, the Chairman of the Elections Committee."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a duty as Chairman on the Committee on Elections to present the



final report of the Committee on the qualifications challenge of Representative Peg McDonnell Breslin. The report is set out in the Journal of June 2 on page 2635 and has been distributed previously on the House floor. The report recommends that the House adopt the action taken by the Committee which dismissed the challenge. Adoption of this report will terminate the challenge proceedings and confirm Representative Breslin as a duly elected Member of this House from the 38th Legislative District. The report, like the Committee proceedings, does not reach the Constitutional issue of residency. The Committee dismissed the challenge on the basis of the petitioner, Mr. Timothy J. Warren, who was not entitled to bring this challenge before the House. The Committee determined that this challenge was untimely and that Mr. Warren was acting on behalf of former Representative, James Riccolo, for whom he worked on the state payroll and that Mr. Riccolo and Mr. Warren had knowledgeably made a political decision not to bring the residency question before any election board or court prior to the general election of 1976 when the people of the 38th District elected Peg Breslin to this General Assembly. Under the circumstances the Committee Report holds that Mr. Warren and Mr. Riccolo have waived their individual rights to invoke the powers of this House to determine the residency issue. Under these circumstances the petitioner intentionally placed the residency question before the voters and made it an issue in the election campaign. Having relied on the judgement of the voters, Mr. Warren and Mr. Riccolo cannot have it both ways by subsequently bringing this issue to the House. The conclusion is based on a law of waiver. The report makes it clear that it is neither the Constitution nor the two year residency requirement that has been waived. There is a lot of misunderstanding on this point. The report holds only that Mr. Warren and Mr. Riccolo have waived their individual rights under our rules to bring this challenge. The waiver would have had no effect on a challenge by another voter in



that district or another Member of this House attempting to raise a challenge. The law of waiver is based on the grounds that people can give up legal rights by inconsistent action or lack of action. Courts have frequently held in election cases that the right to challenge the results of an election, in the absence of fraud, must be carefully preserved or the courts will find a waiver in order to protect the voter's decision. This is entirely proper when the issue could have been settled before the voters voted. The Committee Report would apply this established legal principle to our proceedings and ratify the results of an election which is not itself challenged. Precedence from Illinois Courts and courts of other states are cited in the report. The Minority Report and Representative Mugalian's dissenting report would have this House reach the question of residency and decide it against Representative Breslin. If that is the decision of this House, then there would be no incentive for candidates to raise and resolve these kinds of questions at the time of filing, before the primary or even after the primary and before the general election. If the House fails to adopt this report, we will encourage candidates for the House to bring residency challenges here even when they have reason to challenge their opponent months earlier. We would be encouraging political opponents to continue their campaigns into the Session and to ask this Body to upset the results of elections when all that could have been avoided by taking legal action before the election. The policy of the Committee Report is sound, it's based on precedence and the Constitutional respect for the integrity of elections. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the final report of the Committee on Elections and the qualifications to Representative Breslin."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to amend or to substitute a motion and that is that we move to adopt the report entitled Minority Report, thereby declaring the seat of which Peg McDonnell Breslin



was elected as being vacant. And I refer you to the question of waiver. I think that's adequately covered by the dissenting report of Representative Mugalian, it's also covered in part by the Minority Report. I'd like to point out to you also that the Supplementary Report supporting the so called Majority Report, felt that it was necessary to bring in the issue of residency because that's the real Constitutional question. There is an entirely new theory here that if you will accept the theory of waiver that the...that an individual can waive a Constitutional protection and right of the public. Then my knowledge and my belief that the law has always been that that which is void at the beginning is void forever and that that question may be raised at any time. Be that as it is, our rules and our statutes provide a method of challenging the seating of a Member of this House. In this instance it's admitted that Mr. Warren did file his challenge in due time as provided by the statute and that he was a qualified elector of the district from which Mrs. Breslin was elected and therefore he proceeded the way that the law provided. And there is no waiver in that regard. Remember this, there is no way that you can challenge a persons right to be seated unless she is first seated, then the right to challenge arises. This law is well established. It was used by Peg Breslin in her appeal early in December when Mr. Warren attempted to take her deposition. She cited the law and cited the fact that until she is seated this question is not before the court and not before any body. And the court sustained her and said, 'Yes, until you're seated, there can be no challenge.' So I say to you that it's not a question of waiver, it's a Constitutional question of residency. Do we accept her theory of domicile and residency or don't we? You know, I don't enjoy doing what I'm doing here. I find it very unpleasant. But I think that we all have a moral and a legal obligation. And I think we ought to think back to about five and a half months ago when we signed an oath and held our hands up and swore to



uphold the provisions of the Constitution of this state. And that's all I'm trying to do. I hope to hell that we do abide by our obligations and we do unseat Peg Breslin and I hope that when she is qualified in October they will reappoint her to her seat. But until that time I think we have to take the action that we are compelled to take and that is to find that that seat is vacant. I move the adoption of the substitute motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the vote on this question is unlike any other vote in this entire Session. It is unique in at least two ways. First and obviously it concerns the seating or unseating of a colleague. This is the first Member eligibility question under the 1970 Constitution that this chamber has been asked to address. Secondly and more importantly, I believe, this vote is one of a kind in that we are voting as judges. It is not a legislative function that we Legislators perform on this matter. In this vote we sit as judges. We sit as judges to the same extent as do the Justices of the Illinois Supreme Court. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we ought to be guided in our debate, in our vote, by those standards we would use if we were in fact wearing judicial robes. What kind of standards are in order here? Generally, the standard is that we would look only to the evidence and the law. All motions of friendship, partisanship, or personal involvement must be set aside. An impartial judge is also unaffected by his personal attitude toward the advocates of the party or parties in interest. One thing more, there may be a misunderstanding concerning the import of the rule that in this situation it is this Body and not a court that makes the decision. I have heard some comments that I think misunderstands the meaning of that. That rule does not mean that we can vote any which way that we wish. Yes, it is our decision but a decision not based on personal whim nor a decision that can ignore the law. And the law



that is applicable, Mr. Speaker, is our own State Constitution. We are sworn to uphold this. There are three reports. There are apparently four reports. And I hope that all of you have studied these reports. I am the author of one of them. My report states in essence that the final report moved by Representative Laurino, the Chairman, which is based on the principle of waiver, is without any basis in law and is totally absurd. In my view, the question is not a close one. Our duty is clear. Our duty is to uphold the Illinois Constitution. This is one Roll Call, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, where one should not vote for the Sponsor nor vote against the Sponsor. This is one Roll Call where one should not be returning a favor or honoring a commitment. And that can be a very dreadful thing, honoring a commitment. Would you like to be on trial where the judge had made a commitment before the trial? Yet I know that many of you have been asked how you intend to vote. If you said 'yes' or 'no', did you make a commitment? You cannot rely on the Committee vote. You know it was really tied. It is not a party issue. I should say, it should not be a party issue. In short, try as one might, there is no easy way out. You can't even say that the buck stops with me. The buck never left. It starts with you and it stays with you. There is nothing complicated about this question at all. Our Constitution requires the Legislator to be a resident of the district for two years prior to election. It also has other requirements like age and citizenship. There really isn't any dispute as to where Mrs. Breslin lived, worked and voted until less than a year before the election. It was in the City of Chicago, not in the 38th Legislative District. The question of residence is easily and quickly settled by public record. Mrs. Breslin voted in Chicago in two elections in 1975; February 25, '75 and again on April 1, 1975. In the process of voting she signed the usual affidavit. On both dates she swore under oath that she resided at 518 Fullerton Parkway in Chicago.



One may take the position that she was not a resident of Chicago in 1965 but..and that she is guilty of vote fraud on February 25 and on April 1, 1975. I suppose one can hardly make that argument. Yes, it is that simple. All the court cases and legal jargon notwithstanding. Mr. Speaker, being an Illinois Legislator isn't all fun. It's long hard work, it's mental...it's a mental and physical health hazard. A vote of this kind is very unpleasant. But, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it came with the job. I am forced to vote, forced by the evidence and law and the oath that I took, forced to vote that the seat now held by Mrs. Breslin be declared vacant." Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the Majority Report. But I think that the Minority Report is based on a Constitutional provision that there is no question, it is there and requires a residency requirement two years prior to an election. Those Members of you who were here in the 77th and 78th General Assembly will recall the long hard debate we had on that very subject. The subject to determine where a student who was attending a university was eligible to vote. We talked about an abode, a home, a house, a sorority house, whether they should be required to go home to vote, that there home where their parents lived would be their residency. We never did define it. And we left it alone and went on to other business because at that time we couldn't define that the farthest to define residency in the Constitutional Convention, for some reason or other, did not define the residency issue. It simply made a requirement: So who can really say? Is it a state of mind? Where we think we live, where we think our residency is, where we were born, where we were raised, where we vote, where we do our business? I find it very difficult to make that definition and to make that definition is what we have to do here. In our own minds we've got to decide that issue,



but I don't think that we can accept the Minority Report on that one issue. All of us run for election and we campaign hard and everybody sitting in this room has proved that they are good campaigners and the people have sent them here to represent them. This was an issue in that campaign. The people in that district were aware of the issue and they voted and they voted to elect Peg Breslin to represent them in the 80th General Assembly. I think it would be very difficult for us to say to those, those people who went to the polls and made a decision and say to them, 'You made a faulty decision, we're sending Peg Breslin home, you appoint somebody else to replace her.' It would be a serious error, in my judgement because the Constitution simply does not define residency. And if we were to go through that issue again as we did some four and six years ago, this Body would not be able to come to an agreement of what that definition is. We also have the same problem in determining who is eligible for aid at our universities. Does a student from another state come into Illinois and after they're here and in school for a short time, are they residents of the State of Illinois and not in a position to pay out of state tuition? We've debated that issue and I don't think we've ever come to an agreement really on when that student becomes a resident of this state. Do they become a resident when they leave home? When they leave their parents and come to Illinois and attend the University of Illinois? The Constitution simply is not clear on the issue. What is clear on this issue, my fellow Legislators, is that Peg Breslin offered herself for an election in the district to represent those people in that district and they said, 'Yes, we will accept you to represent us in the House of Representatives in the 80th General Assembly.' I don't see how we can say, 'No' to those people in that district and I'm going to support and urge you to support the Majority Report. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a day of shame in this House. It's a day of shame of those who have allowed this so called Majority Report to progress as far as it has. It's a day of shame of those men who have used power or misused power to force us into this position. And yes, it's the shame of people who have succumbed to pressures that they would allow themselves to be used in such a manner. When I say to you it's shameful to consider it, it would be a tragedy if adopted; truly a calamity. Because at that point we have said to everyone that we ignore the Constitution, that we ignore the Constitutional Convention debates, that the Constitution is not convenient and that we can change it at will and that if the law may apply to others, it does not apply to us. If we've said that if we elect a 15 year old or an alien, under certain circumstances, the right to unseat that person can be waived. And I say to you that if we can throw out part of that Constitution as we propert to do today, then we can scrap the whole document at will. And this is a very dangerous position for us to be in today. I hope every Member of this House has read the three reports before them because I would hate to think that anyone would presume to vote on this matter if they had not fully read the three reports. And I submit to you that the so called Minority Report should convince you of the rectitude of its position and that the seat be declared vacant. I say further to you that if the Minority Report does not convince you well then certainly the Mugalian Report should because it is a scholarly document that compliments the Minority Report in every detail and expands upon it. And I say to you, that if those two reports don't convince you then you should read the so-called Majority Report. Because the Majority Report should convince you of the rectitude of the Minority because it is empty. It is completely without substance. It's so bad, it reeks so, that regular Members of the Elections Committee had to be replaced for



one reason or another because they would not sign it. I think I was the one that dubbed the Committee, 'The Musical Chairs Committee', it was said in jest but it was true because these... some of these men just could not stand what they were being asked to do. And while the final motion came down to the question of waiver, all the arguments, or the bulk of arguments was made on the question of residence. Before I read the report I would like to discard the appellations of Majority and Minority Report because each of them went to a vote and each of them received 9 votes in favor and 9 votes against. So we're not speaking of a Majority or Minority Report here, we're speaking of two reports. One I submit to you without substance and one drafted in every effort conscientiously to uphold the Constitution. The question of residence was the main argument. Now, I think it is difficult to dismiss the two year residence requirement and the fact that Mrs. Breslin did not satisfy the two year residence qualification. It's undenied that she lived in Chicago for a number of years. I think 10 to 11 years, including the time she went to school in the City of Chicago. She worked in the City of Chicago, voted in 10 elections in the City of Chicago, worked as a precinct captain in a Ward Organization in the City of Chicago. Filed Income Tax Returns with her Chicago address on it, had a drivers license with a Chicago address on it and when she returned to her home, to her original home to apply for a marriage license with her husband, both of them listed their address as Chicago. Now, to contradict these facts an argument of intent was advanced which said that she always intended to return to her native home and run for office. And proof of the intent was attempted to be established by such things as things that were left at home, of weekend visits to her mother and the fact that she kept meat in her mothers meat locker. And I suggested to her and not in jest one day that if she lived in Chicago with her husband but kept meat in Ottawa with her mother, was home where



she lived with her husband or where she hung the meat? I don't mean that to be funny. I admit, it has a funny ring to it. But accepting that argument, Mrs. Breslin could have stayed in Chicago without changing her address and run for election in this district and only move after she was elected. Now I think this is a helling argument. Just think that if you intend to move back into your own district and run for election, this is all that's required and apparently you wouldn't even have to move back into your district. You could run just where you are at the time and move if you win. And I say to you that this opens up every district in the state to carpetbagging. We do have some precedence in this case, just two General Assemblies ago we had a case of a Gentleman who was appointed to this Body and action was brought against him. A Subcommittee considered the case and unanimously decided to declare the seat vacant. He showed the good sense, good grace and I believe respect for the Constitution, to resign before the report was submitted. In another case some years back involving Senator Swinarski in Chicago, under near identical circumstances, Senator Swinarski was elected from his old district, where he did maintain a home and attempted to continue voting, I believe, but moved out of the district and he was unseated in the Senate. So, I say to you that these arguments advanced in favor of intent of residency are without substance and as a matter of fact, they are so vapid that those that framed the Majority Report turned to the equally specious grounds of waiver. And they do cite some cases in support of waiver. I think that has already been spoken to well by Representative Bluthardt and Mugalian. But in all of these cases most of them were different states, different statutes, different Constitutions, different circumstances, but most importantly, not legislative. And it is only the Legislature who has the right to judge the elections returns and qualifications of its Membership. And as Representative Bluthardt and Mugalian have said to you, no one can waive our right to judge the qualifications of our



Membership. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said, those who have brought us to this point have brought great shame on all of us. But I say, we must not violate our oath of office. This is an oath that none of us took lightly and I think it is something that even in difficult circumstances like this, we must remain true to our oath. This is not an easy task. No one enjoys taking a position such as I am taking now. And there's a great temptation to be Mr. Nice Guy. But I think to be otherwise, to do otherwise would be deplorable and thoroughly dishonorable and a confession that we are unfit to sit in this Body. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, I implore you to do your duty. The facts are incontrovertable. We must reject this melodious Majority Report and adopt the Minority Report and declare this seat vacant."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I like all of you regret that this issue is here before us to decide. But decide we must. And we sit not, as has been pointed out to the floor by Representative Mugalian, we sit not as just a Legislative Body on this question coming before us. We sit in a peculiar quasi judicial nature when this issue comes before us, of this kind and it is an issue of great magnitude for each of us. I'm not absolutely certain that the Majority Report is, at least in my individual view, stated correctly in the terms that are used. But I will say immediately that I support the conclusion reached by the Majority Report. When an issue comes before a judicial body the first thing that that body does is look to see whether or not that issue is properly brought before it. Now listening to and having reviewed the written evidence but not being a party to the election hearings and investigation, it would appear to me that on the face, if the issue is before us, that probably Mrs. Breslin does not meet the residency requirement of the Constitution. But have we reached that issue? I think, had this challenge been brought by a regular sitting Member of this Body, as occurred I



believe, in the Senate some years ago, or had this challenge been brought by a voter of that district who was by association, unrelated to a candidate that my view and my decision on this issue would be entirely different. But having been brought by an agent of a candidate it appears to me that the petitioner herein comes to us with all of the obligations of the candidate. And so we look first at the question has the the issue arrived here correctly and is it an issue, on that basis, that we can decide? In my view it appears that the candidate has failed to meet the challenge requirements that are provided and required in the law of this state, both at the time of filing and at the time of the printing of ballots for inspection. And so it appears to me, in my view and perhaps it is a rationalization, that the issue has not properly come before us so that we do not therefore reach the residency issue of the Constitution. And therefore, I would support the result of the Majority Report or the recommendation that they make. I do not think, therefore, that our action on this matter bars us or controls us in future issues of this kind that might come before this Body while we are here or in any year hereafter. Because each challenge is unique in and of itself and it appears to me that this challenge does not properly arrive before this Body so that we can even reach the issue of residency. I think that the issue could properly have been put and in the manner that it came here it probably prevented, or at least persuaded someone else perhaps, to have brought the challenge who could lawfully have done so. That is not our fault, that is not the fault of the person who is challenged herein. This is the only issue that comes before us and in appearing to me that it is not properly brought we vote upon whether the issue is here or not without reaching residency and I therefore would support the recommendation of the Majority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."



Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I think many of my good friends will appreciate my feeling in speaking on this subject. During my first term I had many friends come to me and suggest to me that the quarrel that I was engaged in with Speaker Blair over the Regional Transportation Authority was not a good thing for a freshman Republican to be doing. And I had many friends tell me that I would be very wise not to speak, not to express myself, I've made a lot of mistakes, maybe that was one of them. I don't know. But I feel better at night if I try to follow my conscience and shed some light on subjects. I know that this is a, for some a partisan matter, for others it's a Constitutional matter. And I suspect that many Members of this House have not taken the time or had the opportunity, because of the heavy press of business, to read all of these various reports. I would like at this time to highlight what I have extracted from reading all these reports and I have six documents on my desk. I'd like to tell you why I think this matter, I would say has been bungled, but it is a confusing subject. And I think conscientious Members can express themselves from all different directions and all different perspectives and reach different conclusions. And I respect, having studied this...however you vote I can see that anyone could justify that vote. I looked at the Majority Report and to really summarize it, it simply says that when somebody goes out and knows that there's a question concerning residency and decides not to raise it in the primary or before the general or when petitions are filed but says, 'I'm going to take a chance and I'm going to run with it. And we've got a chance to elect two Democrats so let's take a gamble.' Then when that, when all the candidates, the 11 in the primary, the Representative that we're speaking about finished first in that primary, when they all go out and raise their money and get their campaign workers going and one of those candidates knows that there's a question of residency and intentionally decides not to do it, I think the Majority Report



is saying, 'You've come in here with dirty hands'. They speak to the doctor of waiver. I think the report also refers to a estoppel, which is a traditional legal document that people have been laying in the bushes and haven't been forthright and thought they'd have it both ways don't deserve...don't deserve to come in after they've lost and try and upset the apple cart and come to this House. So I think the policy question is, from the point of view of the Majority Report, if we allow them to come in why we're allowing them and encourage them to gamble. And we may well have, as some of my Republican colleagues suggested to me, have Chicago Democrats coming out to Lake County or all over the state and running. What we're going to do? If we accept them to come into the House we'll be encouraging them to gamble and do exactly what was done in this case. Now I'm sorry that the Majority Report left out the legal and the Constitutional question of residency. That was a deficiency. So much for that, that's all I see in the document. The Minority Report came in pretty much...the doctrine or the question of waiver and they got into some of the facts and concluded that Representative Breslin was not a resident. They spent a lot of time talking about the reason that it was legitimate to come before the House here because you couldn't go...take it to the court. But what I find deficient in the Minority Report is that, like a number of documents in this case, they're very much like pleadings that you find in court to...to reach a conclusion and to leave out facts. There are a lot of facts with respect to the situation of Representative Breslin that are left out. They didn't mention that she went to gradeschool in the district, specifically, or that she went to high school there. They didn't mention her church membership, she maintained her membership at all times in the church in that district. Didn't really mention specifically that all of her property or a lot of it was kept at this home and she'd come home on weekends, didn't even have to bring a suitcase because there was



so much stuff there. They didn't mention that she contributed toward the payment of taxes, that a lot out in the district had been rezoned by her father so that she could have her future home constructed there. Now, these are not all the facts but I think that we ought to have all the facts so that we can weigh them one against the other and make a conclusion. So, I think the Minority Report is deficient too. I might say at this time, the reason that I took an interest in the subject is two-fold. I think one, I happened to be sitting in the Elections Committee one night when this whole thing erupted and I've never seen so many red faces and screaming and yelling and pounding and partisanship. And I think it became polarized over Kempiner's Election Bill but it carried on over into this issue. So I began reading it. The second reason I take a great interest in this is because I was similarly situated. When I was elected to this General Assembly I had lived in Washington D.C. for ten years. I'd been away from my district for ten years. I'd only lived in Lake County four years of my life and I was a precinct captain in Washington D.C. And I had a political job in Washington D.C. I was a congressman's assistant. I transferred my church membership to Washington D.C. I purchased a home in Washington D.C. I sold my home in Lake County. Just one thread continued my residency from a technical point of view and that is I had read before I went that when you leave on federal business you have a right to continue voting. So I continued to vote by absentee ballot. Now her case is different and for many of us who are politicians voting is such a predominant thing that you put it above church membership and other things. So that is the reason I've taken an interest in this. Representative Mugalian's dissenting report, I think I might say to bring this...that observation to a conclusion, I think the Representative we're considering here is probably eight times as much contact and relationship with her district as I had with mine. And yet I think I know that district and



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the people knew me when I was elected. Representative Mugalian issues a report which does two things. He's right when he says it's a shame that this has become a partisan matter. That's essentially one thing he says. I think he's wrong when he says that all of the facts are in here because he doesn't add any more facts, he says the facts are all in the Minority Report and I don't think they are. The Special Concurrence.... most of you have probably not read. This is the first document that makes any effort to tell us, what does the Constitution mean when it says residency. Most of you will know that when we had the subject of the Equal Rights Amendments and whether the three-fifths requirement in the Constitution:... should be adhered to. I said on this floor.... we all took our oath to support this Constitution and I mean that and I still mean that. Three-fifths is very clear. Residency, unfortunately is not clear and that's one reason for all of the confusion. This report, the Special Concurrence that came out later supplies a deficiency that's not in any of the prior reports because sure we can say, 'Sure let's stick with the Constitution, throw her out, she's not a resident.' But the real question is, 'What are all the facts and what does residency mean?' The purpose of the Constitutional requirement is that the office holder should be familiar with that district and have some contact with it. Secondly, that the citizens of that district should be familiar with the office holder. And thirdly, to prevent an office holder from going into a district without any contact and buying an office. Now, I might say.... if you don't have the Special Concurrence, you ought to look through it. It mentions a lot of things that are left out with respect to the relationship that this Representative had with the district. These are facts that are left out. I don't say that they are going to convince you to seat her or not to seat her, but they are facts and they supply deficiency. Getting on to the last two documents; I have a report dated January 18, 1973... four years ago, from the Illinois Legislative Council defining residence. The reason that I have this and bring it to your attention is because obviously this is four years before the controversy and it wasn't drawn up by lawyers or politicians



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

on either side who were trying to reach a conclusion. And it simply said that decisions of the Illinois Supreme Court indicate that there are two elements to residence. One, a physical presence in the place. And two, the intention of remaining there as a permanent home. So that if you leave from a district and go into Chicago and live in an apartment with no disregard to what a beautiful city Chicago is, I can hardly imagine a county boy or a country girl wanting to go to Chicago and make it a permanent home, but there has to be some..... I have..... I want to say, I offered that in a light vein in this very serious subject. And this report says that for a hundred years there are cases saying that, that from the point of view of residency durable kind known as domicile; in order to abandon it you have to go somewhere else, physically be present there, and have the intention to make it your permanent home. Even though I went to Washington D.C. and bought a home and joined a church and all these things, it was not my home because I told all my friends I was coming back someday to run for election in Lake County the same way that witnesses in this case indicated that Representative Breslin had told them. And to remove a little of the partisanship, one of those witnesses that came in was a Republican State's Attorney from Putnam County and the other was a Democratic State's Attorney of LaSalle County. And they both testified that they had gone to law school and known over a continuous period of time the Representative.... and on several occasions over this period of years said someday she's going to return and run for that office. Lastly, we lawyers know that you can pay lawyers a lot of money and you can pay staff a lot of money and still there's something left out. In all of these documents, until today I did not find anywhere a report from those who attended the Constitutional Convention and indicated what they meant in the Constitution by two years of residency. And I'll read from this report and this will conclude my remarks. The recommended lowering of state and district residence requirements is from five years down to two, reflects the desire not to punish a person because of population mobility while at the same time not



to encourage carpetbagging. On the one hand, a qualified individual who moves into the state and district should be able to serve the citizens of the district if the voters approve. On the other hand an individual should not be permitted to willy-nilly move into a state and district without any background and experience in the state or district. I think what this really says and I offer this to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. You must judge as you know the facts and understand the facts that Representative Breslin has some background and some experience to tie her to that district. And the second question is, is there any evidence anywhere that she abandoned her intention to return and run for office there? I offer these remarks and hope that they are somewhat helpful to you in dealing with this question which I don't think is partisan, but it is Constitutional and it is legal and I know it's painful for all of us. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative the Pages have some notices of Conference Committees that have to meet at 4:00 so I will ask them to go out and pass those out. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been surprised by some of the blanket statements of lawyers about residency. We are told that it is very clear it is white or black or this or that and any lawyer knows that that is simply not the case. We are told that intention has nothing to do with the question of residency and that is simply not the case. And any lawyer who has had first year whatever it is in law school, constitutional law, knows that the critical element is, in fact, intention with regard to the question of residency. We know well enough that the problem of residency is not confined to the General Assembly and to the problems that we have. It is involved in every matter in which citizens decide whether to vote. And some of the distinguished Members who have children away in a different city, in a different town, in a different state, it is as clear as anything can be that those children can vote either in that state or in their home district depending on the question of intention as to what they say is their residency. The cases have made that equally clear. A classic case



from the neighboring state of Missouri, a ten year residency requirement to run for Governor. A young man leaves the state of Missouri, he goes to law school at the University of Virginia, he goes from there to Atlanta where he is a United States Court of Appeals Clerk, he goes from there to Washington, D.C. where he works in a law firm in Washington, D.C. for a number of years, he returns to Missouri five years before the election. The Missouri Constitution requires ten years of residency. Has he complied with the Missouri Constitution? The court had no difficulty with the problem. They said that even though he was away for many, many years, he had roots; if you will, roots in the State of Missouri that even though he went away to other states and, in fact, was a practicing lawyer in Washington, there was evidence indicating that his intent was to return to Missouri and it was so found that even though he had physically been present in Missouri only five years that, in fact, he was a resident for ten years and he complied with the Missouri Constitution. We are told that the facts are clear in this matter because the distinguished Legislator involved worked and lived and voted in Chicago and, therefore, we are doing something dreadful in even considering the question as to whether she has complied with the residency requirement. Another classic case that dealt with that precise point, the McKeldon case, Gallagher vs. Board of Supervisors in Maryland. A requirement in Baltimore that in order to run for Mayor of Baltimore, you must have been a resident of the City of Baltimore for ten years as I recall the case. McKeldon, the individual involved, had been the Governor of Maryland. He had lived in Annapolis. He had voted in Annapolis. Thus, he had lived and voted and worked in Annapolis during the very period that the Charter of the City of Baltimore required him to have been continuously a resident for ten years of Baltimore. The court had no problem with that situation, notwithstanding the absence of any statutory provision in the State of Maryland relating to people who live in other cities while in public office and notwithstanding the fact that he had worked, lived and voted in Annapolis during the period the court held



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that he was properly qualified to be, to run for the Mayor of the City of Baltimore. And in view of those cases, I would want to tell you that if we were to wrap ourselves in judicial robes, if we were to ignore the question of waiver, the fact of the two bites of the apple, the fact that citizens have been heard on this issue, the fact that if in fact the other candidate wanted the matter adjudicated in the court, there exists ways to have it adjudicated. I would want to say to you that the respectable body of opinion is that the most critical factor in the determination of residency is the question of the intention of the individual. We deal with it everyday when we have students in Champaign-Urban who come from Minneapolis. Are they a resident of Minneapolis or are they a resident of Champaign? Is the student a resident of St. Louis or of DeKalb, Illinois? And I would tell you that we deal with those problems everyday and the courts accord the overwhelming and final decision to that critical element of intention. And I believe that there is evidence in this record to make clear that this candidate and this Legislator on whom we are called upon to vote, had very firm roots indeed in that district, that those firm roots indeed coincided with the intention of the Legislator to return to that district to her family home. And so, Mr. Speaker, I will have no problem at all voting in support of the Majority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, regret standing before you without a clear-cut opinion from the Committee. However, I do have three specific points that I'd like to suggest to you. The first one is if indeed you are not satisfied with any of the reports, either the majority or the minority or the two complimentary reports, that indeed instead of voting for Mr. Bluthardt's substitute motion, that you vote 'present' and do not vote for that. I don't know if you've ever seen a person unseated before, but it certainly is no pleasant scene at all. It is an execution of sorts and I suggest to you that your votes mean that much. I suggest even further that if you have not made up your mind,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

if indeed it is confusing, as I'm sure it is to many of us, that you do not vote with Mr. Bluthardt's substitute motion. My next point is, we have one report before us from a Member of the Elections Committee. It's entitled, 'Dissenting Report of Representative Dick Mugalian on a Qualification Challenge to Representative Peg Breslin.' Now, Dick Mugalian is Vice-Chairman of the Elections Committee, but I understand due to illness, he did not attend a hearing where the evidence was taken. Further, I understand he did not read the transcripts of the evidence available to him. Not only that, but before he wrote the report, he did not pull the official file and read the affidavits and certificates on file like Representative Breslin's passport reflects her residency of Route 2, Ottawa. Her law license reflects her residence in LaSalle County. Affidavits from seventeen people were on file who swear under oath that they corresponded with and visited Representative Breslin at her home in Route 2, Ottawa. They're all on file. Then there are further affidavits from her doctor, her pharmacist and her beautician with accompanying records which reflected Representative Breslin's residency at Route 2, Ottawa. I feel a person ought to hear the evidence. I again say to you that... compliments my suggestions to you that if you are not clear on the issue, that you should not support Mr. Bluthardt's motion and indeed ought to vote 'present' if you're not of strong conviction. My next point is that Representative McDonnell Breslin, Peg McDonnell Breslin won by a vote of six thousand votes. In a democracy, that's a referendum of the people. Where her opponent raised the residency issue and the people chose. The people overwhelmingly elected her. I suggest to you a vote to unseat is a very, very tough vote. I'm reminded of the statement that Representative Mann once said, that it's clear that the people in Illinois want a death penalty. The only difference is, they don't want an execution. I suggest to you that you might find a residency issue something for you to be concerned about and maybe not clear in your mind, but a vote to unseat is an execution. I'm going to support the Majority Report."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when we get elected as a Representative, representing our district, we vote on Resolutions and we vote on Bills. And there's basically only three things that we can take into consideration on almost every vote that we cast. Some of our votes are cast out of principle and how we feel government ought to be run. Some of our votes are cast along party line and the way we feel that our parties want us to vote. And the third consideration and sometimes the last consideration is the vote in favor of what we feel our constituents would really want us to do. I rise in support of Peg McDonnell Breslin. Just like all other things that go on in this House, all of the facts in this case aren't known. We don't know all the deals that have been cut at Representative Breslin's expense. How many people are voting their conflicts without telling us who they're related to, what they're getting out of it, how many old debts they're repaying and how many debts they're storing up to use at a later date? All at the expense at a woman who ran and won her seat just like each and every one of us but by some 6,000 votes. Many of you sitting back in those chairs and very comfortably, didn't win your election by 6,000 votes from the people in your district. And for those Members of the Democratic organization out of the City of Chicago who are going to vote against Peg McDonnell Breslin, you ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Because it's the system that we operate under in the City of Chicago that required her to vote in the 1975 Mayoral campaign. Did you know that the individual who brought this case to us, who brought this challenge to us, tried to beat her by saying she was a plant of the Daley organization in the 38th District; that he ran an anti-Chicago campaign; that he had spread rumors that Mayor Daley was paying for her campaign expenses? And for all of the rest of you that haven't made a deal, I suggest that you're voting because you're afraid that some



bright, aggressive young person is going to move into your district and run against you in the next election. That's your conflict. My conflict in relation to this matter is that I know Peg McDonnell Breslin better than most people in this room. I sat in class with her for four years at Loyola University. She's an excellent individual, an excellent human being and her intent and her residency, in her mind, was always in Ottawa, Illinois. She was a student in an urban university and she was a visitor to the city as long as I've known her. You also know that you can get nonresidents off the ballot by objecting to their petition and proving that they are not residents of that district before the election. That's what this individual should have done instead of coming to us after he lost. This individual who's bringing this challenge was never elected by the people of his district in the first place. He was appointed for a year and then was voted out. The people ought to have the right to have the Representative that they want. And in the 38th District that's Peg McDonnell Breslin, by over 6,000 votes. I encourage each and every one of you to support the Majority Report and vote for Peg McDonnell Breslin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's an extremely hard time for all of us and it certainly is for me. I've gotten to know Peg Breslin and I think that she's a great person, and I have a marshmallow heart as I've said. What disturbs me is if we adopt the Majority Report, what does it say for the future? I would say that what we should do first of all is submit an Amendment to our State Constitution to the people for ratification striking the part that says residency requirement the two year residency requirement in order to run for office because it's going to be meaningless. If intention is what counts . . . and I'm not a lawyer and I've listened to all of the lawyers talk about this . . . or where your roots are, that I think anybody can run anyplace in the state if they grew up



no matter ten years away or not. Someone could come into my district and run and they may have not lived there for a long time and they can say, 'Well, I intended to.' I don't see how we can bother even thinking about bothering about that provision of residency once we establish the precedent for Peg Breslin. One of the speakers who spoke, who I believe is a former prosecutor, ... I admire him greatly and I listened to what he had to say. And I was baffled by it because I am not an attorney. He said that if the issue had been raised under different circumstances, brought by someone else.... a Member of the House or someone from the district who was.... I gather... I think he meant untainted, he would tend to vote to support the Minority Report. I don't think it matters who brings the issue before us. You may hold him in contempt and with disdain, but would a prosecutor turn down evidence of wrongdoing because it was someone from ... (tape skips)... maybe a criminal. You know, I don't think that's really relevant and I'm a little bit baffled why he brought it up. It was brought before us and I don't think the political connections.... and I admit it certainly was for political reasons. It's venal, it may be contemptable but I don't think that's relevant. It was brought to us. So I don't.... what disturbs me is what does it hold for the future for elections? If intent is all that counts, if you're roots are there because you grew up there, then we might as well change the Constitution. And Lord help us all.... it's going to be a lot of fun in the elections then, I think."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we've heard a lot of comments. All of them have some merit and yet I think if you listened intently, you probably have some mixed emotions at this point. I have the disadvantage, I suppose, in one respect of not being a lawyer and yet maybe I have the advantage of having been around awhile and this is not the first one of these things I've gone through. Certainly anyone that's had to do with voting and so on knows that up to a point, residency is a matter of intent. And sometimes it's a pretty thin line as to where a man really



declares his residence to be as opposed to his abode. But I think that there's some significant things here and I don't want to hear anymore comments here saying, 'Well, if you don't do both thus and so well then shame on you and so on.' I think everyone of us has the responsibility to vote the way that we think we should vote. But I think at least these facts came out. Peg Breslin filed last December for an office. At that time there were eleven candidates. No one apparently challenged her residence at that time. No one suggested that she was perjuring herself because she had signed a statement that she resided another place less than two years before and then signed that she was a resident in her district.... in which she was elected later. She campaigned and apparently these eleven candidates didn't raise the question then or file any criminal charges against her for committing perjury. She won the primary and no one said anything about her residency. But she won the election and now eight months later we're trying to decide whether she was legally a candidate in the first place. Now if Peg Breslin indeed has perjured herself, she should be prosecuted as a criminal and I have no feeling about that whatsoever. But I think the makers of the Constitution, and I was one of them, and I know what it says because I've read it the same as you have and I've read these reports, which I think are pretty scholarly. If they intended to have the courts to decide this on a legal matter, they would have let the courts do it. But the fact is that the Legislature is to decide who it's Members are and it's the sole decision about whether she sits here or not.... not the courts or anyone else. So it finally boils down to... there has been neglect on a lot of people's part. I think that there's some evidence that she either is not a resident or she committed a crime, I don't know which is true. And I've read these things.... when they came to my attention and I'm sure that you did too. So I guess it finally boils down to who will be better served if Peg Breslin's seat is declared vacant or whether we refuse to unseat her. And frankly, it isn't personal with me because the truth of it is.... on many occasions around here she hasn't voted like I would have liked her to vote so I have no obligation to her one



way or another. I didn't know her before she came here and I probably won't know her after she leaves. So my decision is based solely on why this neglect. It's kind of like the story with the little red hen. Where where all these people for the last eight months and for the year before that when he filed? So I'm going to make my decision solely on the best.... who's going to be better served in the State of Illinois. And that's my prerogative and you can question it if you want to. And I know I'll be criticized on this side of the aisle. Who will be better served.... or will the State of Illinois be better served if Peg Breslin's seat is declared vacant or whether it isn't. And I'm inclined to vote to let her keep her seat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'm going to try to appeal to those of you who I hope have an open mind about this. I have read these Special Concurrences with the Majority Report and if any of you haven't read it... I would urge you to get a copy and read it before you make your final decision and your vote here. It's not so long that you couldn't at least get what you need to get out of it before you make up your mind. I agree with the views of the Special Concurrence with the Majority Report. I think it's very well written. I think the fallacy in the Special Report of Representative Mugalian is that it turns on the fact that she voted in Chicago for awhile. This is not sufficient. Many persons who temporarily reside away from home such as students in college and others.... change their voting and their addresses for convenience. Now you have to get your mail. You don't want to have all your mail sent to the place where you continue to have your permanent address. So I don't think that's sufficient reason for the decision that he apparently has made. But this does not change the true residency. Residency is where you intend your permanent home to be. And I think the evidence is clear that Peggy Breslin intended for her permanent home to be in Ottawa. And I think it's indicative on the kind of document that she used Ottawa on such as passports. Now you don't put down your address as your permanent residence on



your passport as a matter of convenience. That's when you're telling the United States Government that that's where you live and that's where your family and friends can be contacted in case you go overseas and they need to get in touch with you. I think the evidence is clear in this case that Representative Peggy Breslin's home was in the 38th District. The voters of that district believed it overwhelmingly. And the issue was widely understood by them when they went to the polls and elected her as their State Representative. Any doubt that any of you have about that question should be resolved in her favor. There should be a clear-cut case made against her before anybody should vote to unseat her. She is entitled to remain here. To vote otherwise cannot truly be justified under the law. I urge you to forget politics, search your conscience and vote with Representative Peggy Breslin. I believe that justice will be done."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

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

I believe there has been a real injustice done in this case and I am surprised that our Leader and some of our eloquent speakers at this point in time have made no effort to raise that injustice. Probably everybody of the Press, everybody in the balcony and everybody that might hear this later on will know this injustice because it is so obvious that we're bearing it today. Can you imagine how illegitimate this whole thing sounds to the public; the fact that we're determining whether a Legislator can sit and vote for his or her district on the last day of the Legislative Session? There's an axiom in the law that justice delayed is justice denied. And there can be absolutely no doubt in this case that justice one way or the other, regardless of how you vote, have been denied to Miss Breslin. I think that this is something that should bear heavily on the shoulders of the Leadership in this House because they knew this problem and it should have been brought to the attention of the people in this Legislative Body long before this. I wanted to make that comment before just making a few other comments with regard to the attorneys that are present. Every attorney that I've heard stand up today has made the comment that there has been



a great problem in the law for many years in determining what residency means. I take great issue with that. I do not think that there is any problem with the definition of residency whatsoever. The question is one of domicile. And when the Constitution was written, they did not use the word 'domicile'. They used the word 'residence'. And residence has traditionally meant where the person is presently residing. And all of you when you have used the concept of intent, whether it be in the Majority Report or someplace else, are defining what the word domicile means. And there is no domiciliary requirement to run for the Legislature in our state. What is required is residency. It's a very unusual fact to have a person who is on trial as a defendant sign their own judgement against themselves. Most unfortunately, for this articulate fine attorney who I've served on in Judiciary, as I looked at her today, I'm afraid she's signed her own judgement. When she signed the affidavit in Chicago saying, I am a resident of this city, I wish to vote here and I do vote here. She signed her judgement. That judgement says, I am in fact a resident of that city. I feel it is very unfortunate to put the rank and file Members of this Legislature through this ordeal on the last day of the Legislature and even more unfortunate to put Peggy Breslin through this. I am compelled by my oath of office to have to vote against her seating, but I feel that this is something that should have been taken care of much longer ago than this time. It could have been taken care of to her benefit, the people of her district and possibly a special election could have resolved the issue had she satisfied the residency requirement at that time. What's really on trial today is the representative process. And if you feel that it is of no value... if you feel that the residency requirements are of no value or even more important the organic document of our state, the Illinois State Constitution is of no value, then proceed to vote for her seating."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I guess most of you know that I've probably



been involved in as many election contests as anybody in this House. Representative Mugalian has said that we not only sit in this matter as Legislators but we also sit as judges. Well I think he probably should have made that statement when this case first came to life, Representative Mugalian. Because if I understand the Code of Ethics in the Judicial system, it is that judges don't discuss cases that are before them. And all of you know that this case has been discussed by those of us that are judges for the last three or four months. So if we are in fact judges we have broken the Judicial Code of Ethics. Now I'll be very frank with you, Mr. Speaker. As of this point in time I am not sure how I'm going to vote. And I say that for one reason, for several reasons really. If I read the Constitution as I understand it in terms of strict construction, Peggy Breslin is not entitled to that seat. But and there's a big but and I'll use for an example the law as it is now written related to carrying a concealed weapon. All us know that the law provides that it is unlawful to carry a concealed weapon except in certain instances and if you don't fulfill the requirements of those exceptions, if you are caught carrying a concealed weapon you are guilty of breaking the law. But if on the other hand the arresting officer is guilty of illegal search and seizure, notwithstanding your being guilty of carrying a concealed weapon, that case in all likelihood, is going to be thrown out. because the arresting officer was guilty of illegal search and seizure. Now somebody has said that in essence the challenge to a seat is only timely when that person is occupying that seat. But if I read the Election Code properly, the question of residence is not only the basis to challenge entitlement to a seat in this Body, the question of residence is also a basis to challenge a persons right to stand for election. And as I understand it, a challenge to the right to stand for election was not the route chosen in this instance. With that in mind I put forth the question to you and I don't have an answer and that's



why I don't know at this point how I'm going to vote. But I put forth the question to you. The question of whether or not a challenge for a right to stand for election is or is not a prerequisite to a challenge to a right of entitlement to a seat. I don't know the answer to that and so I respond to you, Representative Mugalian, by saying we in fact do not sit as judges here. We sit as a jury. And as a Member of this jury, I for one, in terms of how I vote, find myself to be in the position of a hung jury."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is with a heavy heart that I really get up here to speak today because I too have taken an oath to defend the Constitution and also to defend...as a lawyer, I took an oath to defend it and uphold it. And I know what the Constitution says about residency. And I really have been told, you know, by people on this side of the aisle, I shouldn't get up and talk about this. But I feel down in the bottom of my heart I really have to. Because it goes back about 40 years when I was not here in this chamber, when I was in grammar school. As most of you know, my father was here and I remember a contest that was going on at that time. And there was a Member on the Republican side that was put out and I want you to know, people on this side of the aisle, that he came back, was elected by the people of his district and he served for, I think, some 30 years and became one of the leaders of this Legislature. The other thing I remember back at that time was a decision of the Supreme Court on N.R.A. And after 1936 election when Roosevelt was reelected, somehow the Supreme Court changed that and they said that the court was following the election returns. These are the things that I think about. I was going to make the legal argument, but I don't really think I have to because Representative Katz and Representative Hart have told you what is involved in the definition of residency. I think what we have to take into account here is that we're sitting here as



jurors to judge our own Members, the qualification of our Members and whether or not we think that Peggy McDonnell Breslin should sit. Now this is the last day of the Session. But it just seems to me that if we here in this House are going to go against all of the voters of the 38th District who had the opportunity to raise these issues where it was raised and where it was discussed and she defeated the... her opponent by over, close to, I think, 7,000 votes. I just think that's wrong for us to do and regardless of whether you call it a waiver or whether you call it, that the residency requirements had been maintained because of intent, I intend to vote to seat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we today sit here as a jury. A jury on one of our peers. And anyone who's ever tried a case or who's ever heard a case hears one thing that the judge instructs the jury, 'Without fear or prejudice and to render an impartial decision.' I have to ask the courts question on fear. If I stake my fear that someone might take my seat, that someone might enter my district and beat me, I'm going to vote to unseat her, because I'm afraid. Next, I go to my prejudices. If I vote on Peggy Breslin because she's voted against me on some issues, because she hasn't helped me as much as I thought she ought to have helped, and she hasn't done what I thought she ought to do; Or it might be expedient to beef because of another election coming up, I'm appealing to my prejudices and I would vote to unseat her. But as a Member of the jury, you must rise above fear, fear that you might lose your seat. Fear that we might open up the elective process. We must rise above our prejudices that Breslin has not always done as we wished her to do. She did not always vote with our party as we see our party, that she has not always done the things we think she ought to do. And so we have kept her in a quagmire for six months. And we've laid the pressures on her. You vote for this or you're out. You vote



for that or you're out. But I say, as jurors, we must rise above all of these petty things and look solely at the evidence. As a juror you receive instructions and one of the instructions that you get is that you have to listen to laws defined by the courts. The court or the Majority Report in this case says that we never got to the issue of residency. If we follow that instruction we would be obligated to vote for Breslin. But even if we say, 'Let us look into our consciences, let us look into our hearts and let us weigh the evidence as we see the evidence. How then shall we administer the weight of the evidence? Shall we vote to throw her out because there is a mere naked suspicion? Something that might lead a police officer to make an arrest? Shall we vote to throw her out because there's a probability she might have committed a crime, she might have wrote that she was a resident of one place, when she might have been a resident of another. I point out to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that all of us were declared by the Federal Government, at least the taxing authorities, to be residents of Springfield if you made more than one half of your income here and you were paid in this local, and that was of great concern to us. You were made an involuntary resident. I say that when we weigh this evidence, you have to look at it to say whether there is an even chance that she may or may not be guilty of having a residence in Ottawa. We could flip a coin and soothe our conscience. Then we can go to the other rule. We can say perhaps this case turns on simply the preponderance of the evidence. Whether one or more of us than the Majority would say, 'Let's vote to our Peggy Breslin.' I don't believe that those are the rules that we should follow as a jury. I believe that the rule has got to be beyond a reasonable doubt. I say that we have to extend to her the same protection that we have stood to each other in any time of challenge. No matter what the challenge may have been. I say that we have to find that only after there has been clear, convincing evidence



beyond a reasonable doubt, can we cast her out. If you want to have additional hearings, you want to bring in additional reports, maybe it will be a lesson. At this time, I would say to you as I would say to a jury, there is not sufficient evidence beyond a reasonable doubt to cast out Peggy Breslin. And I say in conclusion, if it is your fear, fear that someone may run against you, that compels you to vote against Peggy Breslin, then stand up on this floor and say so. If it is your prejudices against her, because she has not entered into all of the deals that you, as an individual might like, say so. And I can respect you. However, this is a vote of conscience, it's a vote that you're going to carry with you for a long time and I'd suggest the rules to cast a Member out against 6,000 votes has got to be beyond a reasonable doubt. And of that, Peggy Breslin, is not guilty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I did not intend to enter into this debate but I've been sitting here intently listening to most, if not all of it. I was in my office briefly and listened to it there. I've been one of the ones who, as Representative Telcser knows, I sit here and moan when I hear all the discussion and say that debate does not change anything. In this case, today I think it has changed some minds. I do want to say that I am somewhat offended and I make no apology that I'm a Member of the Republican Party and work at it actively, but the people who have touched base with me, you Ladies and Gentlemen on the other side and asked how I felt about this and what position I was going to take; I want to say quite candidly and honestly that not one suggested that I should vote to unseat Mrs. Breslin because she happened to be a Member of your party. It has all been on the basis that...the question of whether she lived in her district or whether she didn't live in her district. I want to say that for some six or seven years my son lived outside Kankakee County, outside the City of Kankakee. Representative Deavers



knows, he was in Bloomington for a good deal of the time. He worked in Champaign, worked in the Chicago area, Arlington Heights, I'd be quite offended and I think he would too if someone suggested that he were not a resident of Kankakee, because it was his intention that he would always eventually be there as he is now. The voters, when they went to the polls in Mrs. Breslin's district, I'm sure were cognizant of the fact that she spent some time and I don't know how much time in the City of Chicago. I'm sure they knew this. If it was not raised and asked in the newspaper by her opponents, I'm sure it was done by word of mouth, as we all know, when we put our names on the ballot. I listened to what Representative Friedrich said and his discussion as to what her intent was. I feel and this has been mentioned by several of the people who entered in debate, that some of her antagonists should have raised this issue, made a point of it many months ago. Perhaps when she filed as a candidate or during the campaign, rather than to raise it at this particular time. And I want to say, I suppose that some of the people who have worked hours and days and months on this may be disappointed with the position that I take. I hope not. I don't keep a Roll Call on votes down here. I think in my years down here, Mr. Speaker, I've asked two or three times to see a Roll Call and it's never been on the basis of who voted how and how I can repay this person with recrimination, it's been out of a matter of interest. So those of you who feel very keenly about this, I hope you don't keep a Roll Call on me. I don't know Mrs. Breslin except to speak to her and know that she's a very lovely lady, from my brief and limited knowledge her. I want to say that I've known Representative Collins and Representative Bluthardt for many years and I have infinite respect for their ability and their intentions. I've grown to know and respect Representative Mugalian, but when the time comes, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote to seat Mrs. Breslin."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew. McGrew. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me first of all readily acknowledge that Jim Riccolo is considered a friend of mine. But frankly, I consider Representative Breslin a friend of mine. What we're faced with today is a challenge by registered voters from that district on her lack of residency. It boils down to one very simple question. Did she live there? We've got to decide it on the merits. So let's look at the case as we see it. First of all, she registered in Ottawa for the first time in November 21, 1975 just before she filed her petition. Previously had voted in ten Chicago elections, even the 1975 mayoral election in the City of Chicago. Paid income tax, and I heard one of the Gentlemen earlier allude to the fact that we report our passports with the government. I submit to you our government is much more interested in where we pay our income tax, that address reflected the City of Chicago. How are we going to define residency then? In a...rather appalling that the IRS doesn't seem to have that problem. It was your place of abode. There was a gentleman in Galesburg that wanted to register after he had moved and they wouldn't...or excuse me, wanted to vote after he had moved and they wouldn't let him because they said his residency had changed. I've heard many people get up and allude to 'my son went away to college and I consider him a resident of my district'. Well, of course you do, you claim him as a dependent. When your son is married and living in another place and working there and voting and as a precinct captain, do you still consider him your dependent? Do you still consider him living under your roof? I think that is a very, very long stretched imagination. If you look at the...at the record, even those students that go away to college that register there, consider that their home, you'll find them doing such things as filing their income tax with the residency listed at the university. Such things as



paying the vehicle tax at that city such as we had in the City of Macomb in my district. Just a few days ago this very House got up and argued on a Bill that would allow the appointment of a precinct committeeman that did not have to live in the precinct. Where was the big arguments then? Did we have no problem with residency at that point? Of course not. We all said he must live in that precinct, we don't want it any other way. But today, today we seem to have another definition, we've had a great deal of lawyers stand up, telling us that there is this reason and there is that reason. But I submit to you, you and I both know, that if it's important enough...or, and I do not mean that in this case, but if you pay enough to get a good lawyer you can find a loophole anywhere and in any law. And I submit to you that's precisely what's going on today. The question really boils down to, do we defend the Constitution? Or, as alluded by the Gentleman from Cook, have we made a deal with Leadership or even with the union? In fact that...that earlier speech upset me a little bit. I submit to you, I challenge you to look at every vote from the County of Cook that followed the Majority Leader in this House and find a single Member voting differently. Now you tell me about deals. I went to auto...where the UAW was having a meeting. They had the national president, at that meeting he stood up...not the national president but the local UAW leader and suggested to you that it was the union position to have Representative Breslin seated. Now, I don't know what's going on Ladies and Gentlemen, I get pressured from both sides like all the rest of you but I submit to you that the labor unions don't know residency any better than I. If there have been deals cut you check the Leadership on this side of the aisle to look for deals. We've already voted to uphold the Constitution in this very House. On the Equal Rights Amendments I find myself in a very precarious position because I supported the Equal Rights Amendments. But when we had a motion to change it from the three-fifths as written in our Constitution



I voted no. I said, 'Ladies and Gentlemen, the Constitution must prevail or we should change the Constitution.' That's your alternative. Don't try to do it in the House of Representatives, we don't supersede the Constitution of the State of Illinois'. What it really boils down to again is, did Representative Breslin live there? It is not a song, Home is Where My Heart Is. Good Lord, I can say I always intended to live in the biggest house in Galesburg. George McGovern intended on living in the White House. But I don't think he'll declare that as his legal residence. I've heard people say that the...that the challenge was untimely. My God, I don't know what you consider timely. It was filed before we took the Oath of Office this Session. Again, what it really boils down to is one very simple question. Did she live there? And I think the answer is an unqualified no. And I ask you to support Representative Bluthardt's motion."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

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

Rarely do I rise to speak on an election issue. But because of the precedence setting nature and the importance of this issue I feel compelled to express my opinion. This undoubtedly is the most important vote that we will pass all Session and it is certainly the most difficult vote for all of us. For it is not easy for any of us to stand in judgement of this qualifications of one of our colleagues. This vote is so important that it is more important than each one of us and it is more important than all of us and it is so important that it transcends all of our personal feelings. Now I have read the reports and I have listened to the debate and there is one thing that disturbs me and that has been the discussion on the intent of the residency requirement of the Constitution. Now I am not a lawyer, but it appears to me that we are applying symbolism to our Constitution and this we cannot do. The Constitution is the first law of our state. And when the Constitution states that the residency requirements are two years, I believe that that's exactly what it means. Two years. Now as Legislators we have all taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of this state and I know that this vote is very difficult but I feel that we have a moral obligation to support the Minority Report. Thank you."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise to speak on probably one of the most important votes that anyone of us will cast in this particular Session. And I would like to refer to some things that were...that we've said during this past Session. And we've heard much talk about doing the will of our particular districts. And we've heard much discussion about protecting integrity of the votes in our district and about how disgraceful it is when all the votes from our district are not counted when they are cast in certain elections. And we've even heard discussion about ways in which we could relax voter registration laws to encourage more people to vote. And now I see some of those same people who raised those very issues suggesting that we unseat a duly elected Member of this House. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Peg McDonnell Breslin was elected to this House by a majority of people in her district and by a substantial majority. Certainly more of a majority than I myself received. Out of 11 candidates in a primary election she came in first by over 1,000 votes. In the general election she received over 56,000 votes, almost 7,000, 7,000 votes more than the next closest candidate. What we're suggesting today by trying to adopt or speaking in support of the Minority Report is to say that we're not going to count those votes, that we are going to tell all those people who voted to support Peg McDonnell Breslin last November that their votes don't count. I know how the people in my district would feel and I assume the people in the 38th District would feel the same way. How are we ever going to encourage those people to go to the polls again, when we seek to overturn and nullify their votes here today? It's no wonder people are disenchanting, no wonder people think their votes don't count, they don't if you support the Minority Report. I rise and urge you to support the report of the Majority."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've done some research on this matter and as to the question of residence as Representative Ewell said and others, it is an open question as to what is constituting residence as stated in the Constitution. And there are plenty of cases in Illinois Law that go back and forth on that issue and go on one side and then the other. However, I'd like to call the attention of this Assembly to the fact that everyone in the State of Illinois has the right to challenge the petition of anyone running for office, for the Legislature and I think it is within five days after the last day the petition is due to be filed. However, this was not done in this case. There's a question in my mind, wasn't the candidate who is challenging Mrs. Breslin today deficient in his action. There's a question in my mind, isn't he a... from asserting anything about her candidacy when he hasn't bothered to file his objections within the time period he was allotted to do so. And he didn't do anything about it until after the election of November of last year. I would like to quote a case I find in the Majority Report. And as an attorney I can see sense to it. I quote the case of Supreme Court of Illinois in the same court Tulla vs. Hogan, which was a case in which the qualifications of a person nominated as a candidate for the office of sheriff was challenged. The complaint of the losing candidate was filed after the general election was held, just like this case. No objection was made to the sheriff candidate prior to the general election. Just like this case. In applying the doctrine of waive in this case the court held, quote 'A candidate should not be permitted to lie by and point out such objections as the present after the election has been held.' To permit such a course would be to defeat a fair expression of the will of the people. When a candidate to public office makes no objection to the certificate of nomination of his opponent before the election, when a statute provides for the time and motive presenting such objections he should



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

be regarded as having waived those objections that may existed at present of the official ballot of any names of nominees not properly entitled to be there. And this case also is cited... incites further another case Welsh vs. Shumway, an Illinois case in 232 Illinois 54. It seems to me this girl was born in Ottawa, Illinois, was raised in Ottawa, Illinois, she went to grammar school in Ottawa, Illinois, she went to high school in Ottawa, Illinois. She had her family doctor there, she had her beautician there. A Republican States Attorney, as someone had said earlier, testified in her behalf that he knew that that was her home but she did vote in Chicago. As I say, if you look at the Legislative Reference Bureau definitions for residence for Legislators there's a question in our minds because definitions there go back and forth. I adhere to uphold the Constitution, I swore I would uphold the Constitution. But I'm going to uphold the Constitution when I know what it clearly says and when there's a doubt in my mind about residence, what it means; whether it means domicile and it can well mean domicile in this case, as quoted by Representative Deuster when he read from the Constitutional Convention Report; and there's a doubt in my mind because her challenger never bothered to file his objections within a week, I think it is, after the petitions were final. Then I doubt that we have the right to even sit in judgement and I agree with Senator...with Representative Madison, we're not a judge here, we're a jury and I have a conscience and I am upholding the Constitution if I vote to seat her."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I sit here with intense interest, not long ago I attended a convention men from all the states practically, in Illinois were there and somebody asked me, 'How would you describe your Legislature in Illinois?'. And I said, my Legislature in Illinois is a place where the greatest minds in our state speak. And I sit here and listen to these great minds as they spoke here today and I think my analysis of this Body was absolutely correct. And I thank



my God that I was able to sit here and listen to these great minds. And I'm thankful that I live in a country where these minds can speak. Oh, what a great privilege it is to be able to speak. My young son, Ray Ewell, took part of my speech because I was going to tell you that I was sitting here as a jury, as a Member of a jury. And that's just exactly what I am. And as Member of the jury I must listen to the evidence. There's no question about it. And I listen to the evidence. I heard these learned lawyers. I heard a distinguished Member of this Body whom I have the greatest respect with, cry brothers, take both of those reports. And the two reports are the evidence. I think they made the study, I haven't made the study. The Majority Report and the Minority Report and he didn't do it with a political analysis. He analyzed the two reports as he had written them. And I remember when he said, 'You know, I worked in Washington, I believe he said for ten years, but I still claim my residency.' And then I heard another distinguished lawyer whom I have the greatest respect for, Chairman of our Rules Committee... I'm talking as a Member of the jury now. And I heard him talk about the question of intent. And talk about roots. Well I know what he means when he talks about roots over there because not long ago I went back to my native state of Mississippi and I said, I'm goin' by my home. And I went by my home. I regarded that as my home, even though I left there with my hat in my hand, I regarded it as my home. He said it was the question of intent. And then I ran back there in my office and I grabbed Webster's Dictionary because I wanted to know and I looked under residency. And I wrote it down. There were many, this was one of the definitions, it says 'Staying in a place long enough to qualify for certain rights.' I admit that to me even though Mr. Webster had opened the words of imagination and workings of human hearts, even though he's the greatest word builder and the greatest word pager I think this nation or any other nation has ever known, that wasn't quite clear to me. But Zen, the ancient philosopher said that God gave us two ears



and one mouth and which means that we should listen twice as much as we talk. And I said, I'm going to sit here and listen. And I've sat here and listened to this evidence as it has been analyzed and I weigh now the evidence of the Minority Report in the balance and I stake my...take my stand upon the Majority Report. And from the bottom of my heart, this is not a political decision. This is a decision...you know, once I thought I was going to be a lawyer and the Lord didn't want me to be a lawyer and Dean Lee told me so, who sat over on that side there, because I got into a class on pleadings one time and started saying, 'Amen, amen, amen.' Somebody said, if you sleep on your right you lose your rights and I couldn't help but think of that saying from the ancient prophet, 'today is the day of salvation, don't sit around and wait, for tomorrow might be too late.' Don't you see how they dovetailed in? And there was so much in that law school that was biblical I couldn't take it. I had to go on back and start preaching. Dean Lee said, 'That's what you ought to do.' And that's what I do and I loved him. He sat on your side of the aisle over there. I loved him. And that's what I did, I went back...followed the vocation that the good Lord gave me. And as I weigh this evidence here today I remember that ancient rule in the study of principal... Hope I quote it right, (Latin phrase)....

He who speaks through another speaks for himself. If is ever applied it applies because no one said anything about the residency requirement. They went through an election with all of these opponents. No one raised the issue. No one challenged her about that. But the people in that district down there, I think it's the 38th District, the people and they waited until the people in the 38th District spoke and the people in the 38th District spoke through this distinguished Lady and they said to us, 'We want her to stand on the floor and speak for us.' They can't come down here and sit on this floor, they're not entitled to it. But they sent an agent down here to sit on the floor and that agent is one of the most grateful and gracious

Ladies I have ever met. She's sitting over there now, speaking for the people in the 38th District who nominated her and elected her as their agent. And I must go along with the Majority Report, because the Majority Report upholds the right of the people to speak through Peg Breslin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had no intention of speaking today. I sat here and I've listened all through the debate and I do feel in protecting the people of the 38th District in their interests, that there is a few points that should be clarified. Now, as you know, I am the other woman Representative from the 38th District and I think there's been something said about intent. In all this time that has elapsed since Peg Breslin filed her petition and I might say quite a short time before the deadline, and I have felt very strongly that there was not time enough to secure the necessary information to challenge her at that time. I would not challenge her. I did not challenge her. I beat Peg Breslin by 10,000 votes and I intend to beat her again. So I'm not talking from a political standpoint. But I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that one reason that she was not challenged at the time of the filing of the primary petition is because the Democratic Party expected to elect two Democratic State Representatives from the 38th District. And needless to say, I have in my file a little news report from our Honorable Mr. Speaker, where he indicated that he thought so too. And this was right after the primary. Now Mrs. Breslin did not have a permanent place to stay until after the primary, at which time she felt that my precinct of Serena, which is ten miles north of Ottawa, was an ideal place to come. So at this point in time Mrs. Breslin's address is not Ottawa, it is Serena. My address is Ottawa. There is a matter of intent. My question on the matter is; just exactly what did Mrs. Breslin intend when she came back to run? Did she intend to come in at the last minute? What was her intention



and why, as a lawyer she had to know what the qualifications were. And I submit to you that the only answer that I heard her give the people in the 38th District during that whole campaign is, 'I am perfectly legal, I have researched the question and I am well within my rights.' Now I did not contest her but I do submit to you that the people in the 38th District have been waiting for a period of six months for this Body to make it clear to them, is she legal or is she not legal? They want to know. They're waiting for you to make that decision and I think you should weigh it well. Regardless of the votes she received, I have said it during the campaign and I'll say it now and I'll say it again, 'The day that we have an informed electorate is the day that we have better government.' And I submit to you that an uninformed electorate is one of the reasons that Peg Breslin is sitting here today. Now you have a responsibility. It is not a personal issue. I like Peg, Her family and my family have been neighbors for years. I have nothing against Peg. I would be happy to see her reappointed to this Legislature. But I think you do have a matter of principle and you are establishing a precedence that, believe me, you people are all going to have to live with. I can live with it. I already have and I'll live with it again. But if you open up these districts with this precedence, you're going to live with it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would suggest that the people of the 38th District have already preliminarily decided this issue in casting their votes for Representative Breslin. We have heard many, I think, well enunciated definitions of what residency is. Harold Katz spoke about that, Representative Deuster, Dick Hart, I have no quarrel with those definitions. The...the area is a complex one and the courts have generally interpreted residency in the manner that Representatives Katz, Deuster and Hart have so indicated to you. However, for those of you who have not had the opportunity possibly to read



the four reports and who have some quarrel with regards to the Majority Report, I would point out first, as Representative Geo-Karis did, what is Section 10-8 of Chapter 46 under Elections mean regarding objections to election paper...to nomination paper? It says specifically that any legal voter of the political subdivision of which the candidate in question is to be voted for, having objections to any certificate of nomination or nomination papers filed, shall file an objector's petition together with a copy and so forth. Why did we, in the General Assembly, set forth that procedure if we meant that that could completely be ignored? In the area of law we can not raise that the Appellate level or some higher level, those issues in which the parties involved refuse to raise at the lower level or at the trial level. Secondly, the question has been raise, can you really waive a Constitutional issue? I would only elude to various areas in criminal law. As we all know, we have a right to remain silent. We can waive that Constitutional right. We have a right to an attorney. We can waive that Constitutional right. We have a Constitutional right to a trial by jury. We can waive that Constitutional right and I would submit, although I have no question about Peg McDonnell Breslin's residency, that even if there are questions in any of your minds regarding that residency, the idea of waiver, of Constitutional issue is not novel. It is done repeatedly. I would urge you to support the Majority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am a Member of the Elections Committee and I have listened very carefully, because I am not a lawyer, to all of the proceedings, all of the debates and all of the witnesses that came before us. And I have weighed, very carefully, all sides of this issue. It is indeed complex and it is not personal. I feel that the basis of this whole issue is one of Constitutional requirement. And I feel that we must address



ourselves to that particular issue alone. Not to the fact that Peggy McDonnell Breslin is one of the most productive and admired Legislators in this Assembly. But we simply must address ourselves beyond that, to the Constitution of this state, which I also was a delegate to and helped to write. We've heard a lot about intent today. I think indeed intent is important. Each day, in the courts in Illinois, those making the decisions go to the debate of this General Assembly to interpret what we meant by the laws that we passed. In the same way in interpreting the new 1970 Constitution, the courts will and should go to the transcripts of the Constitutional Convention, of the debates of that convention. And in weighing this entire issue, this indeed is what I did, to go back to those debates and read indeed what my seatmate, George Lewis, had to say about Senate...now Senator Knuppel's Amendment. Which would have made unclear this point in the Constitution that we had drafted. I would like to read to you what the Constitution says on the eligibility aspect. It's in Section C of Section II of the Legislative Article. And that Section says, 'To be eligible to serve as a Member of the General Assembly a person must be a United States Citizen, at least 21 years old and for the two years preceding his election or appointment, a resident of the district which he is to represent.' The Knuppel Amendment which came before the Constitutional Convention would have obscured that clear statement. And in rising, Chairman Lewis of the Legislative Committee said, and I quote, 'I would very strongly urge the defeat of the Knuppel Amendment, as it does not correct the problem involved. The wording that we now have does not make it immediately prior to that time, so that there is no question about it. It also leaves out the matter to be a United States Citizen. I realize that to be a voter you must necessarily be a citizen, however by Illinois law, this could be changed. And we intend, on the Committee, that there would be no question about it. Just as the Executive Article that one of the requirements must be a



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

United States Citizen. And finally, we do intend, on the Committee, to have it that he must reside at the time of redistricting, not before and not at anytime during his lifetime before but at that time. So we believe that the Majority Report should be sustained and the Knuppel Amendment should be defeated. That Amendment was defeated, Ladies and Gentlemen. And I hope that with the intent of clarifying this issue that we indeed will review and consider the transcripts of the Constitution. Now I have a great respect and a great admiration for Representative Breslin and I have spoken in Committee and I'm sure she knows of my sincerity in that statement. But I find that I am forced by the oath that I took to uphold the Constitution of this state and the United States, as an elected official, to remain on the Minority Report and vote against seating her."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I like others was not going to rise to speak but I feel greater about this issue than any that's come before us this Session. Some people have asked us to decide this simply on what they consider to be a matter of basic logic. And to argue that the Constitution is clear-cut in this matter. I submit to you that we're dealing more than with a simple question of logic or a specific matter in the Constitution. If that were not so the emotional arguments as well as the logical arguments would not have been made today. And I submit to you that we've got to look beyond some of the things that are said and to realize that indeed, emotion is involved and there's logic on both sides of the argument, because we're dealing not only with law and the Constitution but we're dealing with a human being. We're dealing with someone whose political future can be entirely destroyed by this Body. We're asked to uphold the Constitution and when I took the oath to uphold the Constitution I know what ran through my mind. It ran through my mind that the people were and are the Constitution."



And what we do today is most important to the people. And I submit to you that because the issue is not clear, I can not vote to remove Peg Breslin. Some have submitted that Peg Breslin is a carpetbagger, but I submit to you a carpetbagger is someone who has never been there and Peg Breslin has been there. Her birth was in LaSalle, her church is and was, her school is and was. Who loses if we remove Peg Breslin? A better question is, who loses if we seat her? Do the people of her district who elected her? Do we lose? Do the voters lose? Does the Constitution lose? I submit to you that there may have been deals on this but there were no deals brought forth to me and no one, whether they represented Republicans or Democrats or individuals or businesses or unions, taking a position on this can change my mind. And I submit to you that my mind has changed seven times since this debate started but now I know that there's only one thing I have to submit to and that one thing is, what can I sleep with tonight? What does my conscience say? You can remove Peg Breslin from her seat, but you can't remove the vote of those people that put her in there. And you can't take away the right of every Member of this Body to determine and interpret the Constitution, whether or not he's a lawyer. We're not all lawyers but we're all people and we're all jurors and I submit that you'll sleep a hell of a lot better tonight if you vote to seat Peg Breslin and support the Majority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I initially hadn't felt I'd like to speak on this matter but I think that I must because I think there are two great tragedies in this whole affair. I sat on the Election Committee and I sat on every hearing on the Election Committee and I heard every bit of testimony that was presented in this case. The first tragedy is the fact that we, on the last day of this Session, are deciding this case. Two years ago, about



this time, I sat here awaiting a Resolution of this House to determine whether I was going to be seated or not. And I know what's been going through Peg Breslin's mind and what her thoughts have been for the last six months. And I think it's most unfortunate that the operations of this Body are such that we have to wait till these closing hours to solve this very very difficult problem that is a real tragedy for those of us who get caught up in the election process. The other great tragedy, as I see it, is the tragedy of politics in this case. Sometime last February ten Democrats and eight Republicans were placed on the Election Committee. Those ten Democrats and eight Republicans, many of them who had experience in previous election cases, sat down to determine this case. They sat down in good faith to listen to the arguments on both sides and make a decision. The first two votes that we had, as I recall, initial votes, were votes not to dismiss this particular case because the intitial presentations by the attorneys on both sides, it was quite obvious there was a very serious question of residency. And then somewhere along the line a few weeks later the politics entered the case. And the reason that we're sitting here today trying to decide just exactly what we're going to do, agonize over this decision in a case of an individual, a very fine individual, is the fact that politics has forced it here today. Because I'm of a firm conviction that those 18 Members of that Election Committee had been left alone to sit down and hear the evidence of this case and decide, they would have decide quite logically, as I see it as the initial conversations were, that there was a very serious question of residency and it would have been resolved last March and not today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think this matter has been very thoroughly discussed and I think it's time for the decision and I therefore move the previous question."



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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't rise to speak on this issue. I rise on point of personal privilege and before my vote's cast I wanted to make this known. First of all I want to express my gratitude to Representative Laurino, Mugalian and Bluthardt and yes, even Peg Breslin, for the intelligent reports that were placed on my desk to try to help me make up my mind today. But it's been alluded to by several speakers that deals in back rooms were cut...deals were cut in the back rooms and deals were made to make a decision on this vote. I was asked to uphold the Constitution more than 20 times in my lifetime...my political lifetime. And Mr. Speaker, you sat here with me one night when we had to unseat somebody several years back. I am not only a State Legislator but I am also a Republican Party leader. I have voted with the Democrats as many times as I voted for my Republican Governor downstairs on the second floor. And when I did that my Republican Governor never came up and asked me to vote anything different. Where I felt it helped the people in my district, I voted that way, whether it be Republican or not. And I don't know how many Members in this House know that of our 6,000 Bills that were introduced in this Legislature, in this General Assembly, less than 10% of them were along party line. For anyone to allude that a deal was cut on this Breslin matter, I take exception to it. And before my vote is cast and before I make up my mind, I want to make perfectly clear to the people in the audience, the people in the press box and the people back home, that my vote is being cast with my conscience today and not because of any deal that the Democrats or the Republicans made for me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye'



and 18 'no'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I attempt to summarize in closing, I would ask that the Roll Call be an Oral Roll Call and that way we would avoid the necessity of explanation of votes, I think. And I want to commend you for the fair, impartial hearing that you have allowed us. It's taken about three hours. Is my... I don't believe it's a motion, Mr. Speaker, but it's a suggestion that we have an Oral Roll Call. Is there objection to that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to object. You know, if you're going to be a good judge you wait until the very end. You wait until all of the facts are in. I had some experience in the Judiciary and I made up my mind I'd never make up my mind until I hear all the facts. But I want to at least have the option to explain my vote. And I don't want anybody to take that away from me. It's in the rules and I want that given to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The choice of an Oral Roll Call is not a choice of a Member by request and not a choice of a Member to object. It is on the sole discretion of the Speaker in our rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman asked in his motion that the House be prevented from explaining his vote. I've had my light on from the minute that this debate started. I was never recognized and in turn I want to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Oral Roll Call doesn't preclude the explanation of votes. On this question there will be an Oral Verified Roll Call. All of the Members be in your seats. When your name is called rise, indicate orally the manner in which you desire to vote and simultaneously press the button in front of you. Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, please explain the motion and the effect of the vote."

Speaker Redmond: "I will state the question. The question is on the adoption of the Minority Report in lieu of the Committee Report and to declare the seat to which Representative Breslin was elected to be vacant. According to Rule 79 it requires 89 votes. Call the Roll, Mr. Clerk. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, in closing, as I said, it's going to be rather difficult to try and summarize that which has been said in the last three hours or so. Many things have been said and I said to myself, 'I'm very happy that I retired as an attorney eight years ago, after hearing the rationalization of some people who I thought were outstanding attorneys.' I heard such rationalizations that while the challenged person does not meet the residency requirement, nevertheless someone should have brought the challenge either by a House Member or by someone who is un... Excuse me a minute while I put my glasses on...unrelated resident. It strikes me, Sir, that the fact that Mr. Warren worked for Mr. Riccolo has nothing to do with this case. It's totally immaterial. The question is whether or not he was legally qualified to bring the challenge. Was he a resident of that district and did he bring his challenge as in the time provided by law? The answer to both those questions is 'yes'. Certainly you're not going to have an enemy bring a challenge on your behalf. This challenge is brought in behalf of all the people of that district, in fact, all the people of the State of Illinois. Another one tried to equate his situation when he moved to Washington to take a federal job with that of Peg Breslin. Why they're not on all fours by any means. That person admits that he moved to Washington. That situation is covered by Federal law as well as state law, I believe, certainly by Federal Law. He admitted that he continued to vote in the old district back home and that he did intend to return there. There's no evidence here...there is very flimsy evidence that Peg Breslin really intended to return to LaSalle



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

County or Ottawa. One that really ruffled my feathers was the statement made by a Gentleman over there that this is a partisan matter and that there was something in it for some of the people that are voting to oust Peg Breslin. Well that is entirely wrong. It may apply in reverse but I am positive that the people on this side and on that side who do vote to unseat her are going to vote their conscience and nothing else. I have not...I've tried to avoid making this a partisan matter. I did not ask for a Republican Conference on this because I didn't want it to be a partisan matter and it certainly should not be a partisan matter. It's a Constitutional question that we, by oath, must consider and vote upon. Now I want to go into the special concurrence report which attempts to equate this situation with that of Peg Breslin. The special concurrence with the Majority Report focuses on two points. The first, that Breslin meets the Constitutional requirements for residency and the second that Warren waive his right to bring the challenge. On residency, the concurrence states that residency requirements have three purposes. One, so office holder is familiar with the district and its citizens. Two, so citizens are familiar with office holder and three, to prevent a non-resident from entering a district and buying a public office. They conclude that Breslin's election violates none of the purposes. However, they ignore the fact that the third purpose is to prevent non-residents from gaining office and that she is a non-resident within the meaning of the Constitution. They also ignore the quote of delegate, George Lewis and I believe that Virginia Macdonald brought that up as to the intent of the Constitutional Convention. That quote is in the Minority Report and I hope that you've read it. Now the concurring Members on this special concurrence report, three of which are not even Members of the Election Committee, state that residency is equated with domicile. They state that one must intend to give up his domicile before he loses it. The Illinois Constitution provides



for residents, for voting as well as for holding office. And again I refer you to the Constitutional debates in which the word 'vote' was removed from this provision of the Constitution on the argument that the use of the word 'voting' was superfluous. It wasn't necessary because to be a resident you must be a voter. Now Breslin...Mrs. Breslin admitted in here deposition that since she was voting in Chicago she could not vote in Ottawa. In order to vote in Chicago she testified she had to make...have an apartment to live in. Since her own admission she could not vote in Ottawa for public office, it's incongruous that she could be a resident for the purpose of holding this office. If the concurring Members are correct then she could have stayed in Chicago and voted for Representative of the General Assembly, as Representative Collins pointed out, from the 13th District, while she was being elected in the 38th District. That absurd result may serve her purpose but it is not the intent of the framework of the Constitution. The concurring Members cite King vs. Walsh, the Missouri case involving Kit Bond. The case is distinguishable from this case on the basis that Bond consistently voted in Missouri, where he maintained his residence, while Breslin voted in Chicago where she maintained that she did not reside. And Bonds political activities were limited to Missouri, Breslin's were limited to Chicago. They also cite Gallagher vs. the Board of Supervisors, it's a Maryland case involving Theodore McCelda's candidacy for Mayor of Baltimore. Baltimore City Charter provided that the Mayor must be a resident for ten years immediately preceding his election. The period during McCelda was Governor was excluded for his Baltimore residency he was ineligible to be Mayor. The Maryland Constitution required the Governor to have his official residence in Maryland's Capitol of Annapolis. McCelda had been a resident of Baltimore prior to the election of the Governor. And so it seems that again they are relying on the wrong case. In the McCelda case he was required to give up his right to vote in Baltimore by virtue of



an Attorney General's opinion as it interpreted the Maryland Constitution. It was stipulated that McCelda spent 40% of his waking time in Baltimore, while Breslin spent most of her time in Chicago. McCelda maintained and sold several residences in Baltimore during his term as Governor, where Breslin had five separate apartments in Chicago. McCelda maintained his family in Baltimore and sent his children to school in Baltimore, while Breslin lived in Chicago with her husband. Even if you accept your domicile argument, domicile, under the Illinois law was with her husband in Chicago. Now there might be some question of that and I have before me from the Illinois Legislative Council their file #8-746 of December 22, 1976, which the summary reads as follows. 'Illinois still adheres to the common law rule that a wife's domicile is that of her husband, even if they are living separate and apart.' That is the law in Illinois. Peggy Breslin lived with her husband since May, 1974, when they were elected...I mean when they were married. She signed an affidavit, she signed an oath that she was a resident of Cook County when she took...got her marriage license. The application for a marriage license, lived one year and seven months with her husband. And under Illinois law, her domicile was that of her husband, the City of Chicago. Mr. Speaker, I think we have had...taken enough time of this House. I just want to assure you that I take no pleasure in presenting this but I present it as a Minority spokesman of my party. But I assure you that I do not consider this a partisan matter. Nothing has been offered me and I certainly wouldn't consider anything else. but the question is to whether or not Peggy Breslin is entitled to retain her seat in this House. My conclusion is that she is not and that she should be ousted."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll restate the question again. The question is on the adoption of the Minority Report, in lieu of the Committee Report. And to declare the seat of which Representative Breslin was elected to be vacant. According to Rule 79, it requires a vote of 89 affirmative votes. So there's no misunderstanding, a



vote of 'aye' has the effect of unseating Representative Breslin and the vote of 'no'... Representative Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your inquiry."

Sevcik: "Is the Representative who is being challenged eligible to participate in the voting process?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, she is."

Sevcik: "What if she's the 89th vote."

Speaker Redmond: "As I said before, as my Irish grandmother said, 'We'll bid the devil good morning when you meet him.'"

Sevcik: "Thank you, devil."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... On this question an 'aye' vote is a vote to unseat and a 'no' is a vote that she retains her seat. We will have an oral... a Verified Oral Roll Call and the Clerk will call the Roll. When your name is called arise, indicate orally the way you wish to intend to vote, simultaneously depress the switch. You may explain your vote under the same rules that always prevail, if you so desire. That's of course if you haven't spoken in debate. Mr. Clerk, call the Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've read the various reports and have conducted an independent research of law in the matter. In my opinion special concurrence with the Majority Report accurately states the law. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Abramson votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Adams."

Adams: "Yes, in explaining my vote I...from what I understand when I was sworn in that I must uphold the Constitution and the way I see it I must accept the Minority Report, I will vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Adams votes 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "Anderson."

Anderson: "Aye."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Antonovych."

Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to vote 'present' on this issue and I feel you're entitled to an explanation. My analysis of the facts concerning the residency requirements sway me that Mrs. Breslin is not entitled to hold a seat. And my training as an attorney makes me think along the same lines and it's distinctly enunciated by Representative Griesheimer, I think, the question of domicile and residency in the law in this aspect is quite clear also. But there have been enough doubts planted in my mind by the debate that went on this afternoon and by people whom I respect and for this reason, I will vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Antonovych votes 'present'. Proceed."

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

Speaker Redmond: "E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm going to follow Representative Antonovych, who voted just in front of me and I'm going to vote 'present'. I'd like to explain that 'present' vote. For one who has been there, this Section of the Constitution has touched my life. The first Session that I was elected here, I was elected from another Legislative District. That first Session we reapportioned and when we reapportioned that same Section of the Constitution said that if you decide to run in any part of your district and you are elected thereof and that portion of your district, you must make residency and move within 18 months. I went to legal authorities to research this very same Section of the Constitution when that happened to me. I made my decision and my decision was to move. I did move. If I would vote as a strict Constitutional-ist, I would probably vote to not seat Mrs. Breslin, but I think that based upon the circumstances that have been involved in this situation. Based upon the number of residents in her district that have spoken, I'm only left to do one thing in this



instance and that's to vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes votes 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Jane Barnes votes 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis votes 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Pass."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bennett."

Speaker Redmond: "Bennett votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Birchler."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I've listened carefully to the discussion today and I have one way in my mind to vote that is fair and honest and that is 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Birchler votes 'no'. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt votes 'aye'. Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have listened to the debate here back and forth. I have read all of the reports and while I have been down here these six months, out of Christian love, I have learned to love Peg Breslin and all of the Members of this General Assembly. But I too took the oath when I took this office, standing in the back, with my hand on the Bible, to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And in my determination, I feel if Peg Breslin has not been.. had not been a resident long enough to take the seat here in the General Assembly and I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Boucek votes 'aye'. Bowman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."



Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, first is to the issue of waiver. I believe the Constitution very clearly states that we have the power, the sole power to judge the qualifications of our Members. I believe that gives us concurrence...original jurisdiction, although I'm not an attorney I feel that...that we do have jurisdiction in this case. I would feel differently, I believe, if the challenge had been filed after Representative Breslin had had an opportunity to vote on issues. I don't think it would be wise to challenge a person after you have a chance to see how they're voting in a particular General Assembly. As to intent, I think that's the most difficult issue of all to deal with. It is arguable, it is debatable as we have done. My feeling is that if we are to establish a record here, I think we have to make it clear that intent does require more than what's provided in special concurrence. I myself am from West Virginia. I have a certain love for my home state and I may very well go back there one day. And I'm not sure that that kind of intent is sufficient. None the less, as to...at to the other grounds as to whether we have the right to establish a requirement like that in our Constitution, I think the case law is reasonably clear on that. I think we do have the right, that is to say our Constitution is compatible with the Federal Constitution. This is a difficult decision for me because I don't think we should, if I were to vote on..."

Speaker Redmond: "One minute time, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Just a few more sentences. This is a particularly difficult decision for me because I...I don't think we should have a residency requirement in our Constitution. It's also difficult because I sit so near Representative Breslin, I've come to know her quite well but I feel that if the requirement is there that we are bound to uphold it and I can do no less. I wish I could vote 'present' but I must vote to accept the Minority Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman votes 'aye'."



Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley."

Bradley: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley votes 'no'. Brady."

Brady: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brady votes 'no'. Brandt."

Brandt: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brandt votes 'no'. Breslin. 'pass'. Rich Brummer."

Brummer: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rich Brummer votes 'no'. Don Brummet. Don Brummet votes 'no'. Byers."

Byers: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Byers votes 'aye'. Caldwell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's a serious question in my mind and I've listened to the debate, which I hasten to say has been a very good debate. Excellent on both sides. There's a question in my mind as to whether we should have this matter before us. I think it should have been settled beforehand. No one in this Body challenged...I've been in election contests before during my ten years down here and I seriously question the fact that this matter should not have been settled by the Election Board or the courts prior to this and I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell votes 'no'. Campbell votes 'aye'.

Capparelli. Capparelli votes 'aye'."

Capparelli: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Capparelli votes 'aye'. Catania."

Catania: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Catania votes 'no'. Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems to me that a number of Members are having a lot of difficulty in making up their minds today and I have a suggestion. The burden of proof is on the petitioner. If you are having any difficulty at all in deciding how to vote, I think it's clear that you should



be voting 'present' or 'no'. My vote is 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman votes 'no'. Christensen."

Christensen: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Christensen votes 'no'. Collins."

Collins: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Collins votes 'aye'. Conti. Conti votes 'aye'.

Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Aye, although my heart is otherwise."

Clerk O'Brien: "Cunningham votes 'aye'. Daniels. Daniels votes 'aye'.

Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

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

I sat here, as the rest of you did, hearing various lawyers
speaker on this issue. As to the issue of waiver, we heard

Deacon Davis speak. He's learned quite a bit in law school.

He uses terms such as latches and things of that nature.

As to residency, we heard Representative Katz, one of the
most reknown Members of the Illinois State Bar Association speak.

Now I can only say this. I left Western Illinois to go to

law school in Chicago and I can recall taking the train back

and seeing the green fields and the pleasant scenes, away from

the smoke and the smog of Chicago. And I know what it's

like to go back home. And maybe I lived in Chicago for a

month, maybe six months without going home but I was darned glad

to get back there. Just like Peg Breslin was. And I sat

here and I listened to a Member of this Body who was at

the Constitutional Convention, Representative Friedrich. And

the two of us haven't always agreed on issues, but as I listened

to him he made a great deal of sense. What's good for his district

and what's good for this state, I would have to go along with.

I, like he, will be voting 'no' on this. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Darrow votes 'no'. Corneal Davis."

Davis: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Corneal Davis votes 'no'. Jack Davis."

Davis: "Aye."



Clerk O'Brien: "Jack Davis votes 'aye'. Dawson."

Dawson: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dawson votes 'aye'. Deavers."

Deavers: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deavers votes 'no'. Deuster."

Deuster: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster votes 'no'. DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the same reason that Barnes mentioned before and he reminded me, I was undecided, but I had to move three times in chasing my district and it cost me money and aggravation. So I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "DiPrima votes 'aye'. Domico."

Domico: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Domico votes 'aye'. Doyle."

Doyle: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Doyle votes 'no'. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Wishing with all my heart that I could perceive my duty differently, I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "John Dunn votes 'aye'. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ralph Dunn votes 'aye'. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, after listening, reading all the reports, listening to the debate, my vote is based on two factors. One, is a sincere and extensive debate we had several years ago and tried to define residency for students after 18 year olds were given the vote. And second the voice of the voters in Peg Breslin's district. Therefore, I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dyer votes 'no'. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just very briefly, I want to thank Representative Griesheimer for his remarks about the words 'residency' and 'domicile' as it relates



to me. I was 95% certain in my mind. I've listened to the debate, I've read over and over these reports, all of them on different days, attempting to make, what I thought, was the proper decision. And as I stand back, after listening to all the debates and what Representative Griesheimer had to say and I think he was right on target in taking a very objective view that if where the name Peg Breslin appears in these reports, if it was my running mate, Cal Schuneman or my seat mate, Tom McMaster or my own name, I'd still have to vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ebbesen votes 'aye'. Edgar. Edgar votes 'aye'.

Epton. Epton votes 'aye'. Ewell."

Ewell: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell votes 'no'. Ewing."

Ewing: "No... Yes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewing votes 'aye'. Farley. Farley 'pass'. Flinn."

Flinn: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Flinn votes 'no'. Friedland."

Friedland: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Friedland votes 'aye'. Friedrich. Friedrich votes 'present'. Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a graduate of the University of Illinois with a degree in History and Political Science and son of a former Member of this House who served with Representative Sandquist's father and he was an expert on political and elected law. This is a provision of the Constitution and it has been more honored in the breach than it has in the following. And when the people stand up and act like it's the holy biblical encyclopedia, I have to laugh. Because when it says the purpose of the Legislature to give the incumbents the opportunity to run in whatever district they wanted to run, it was not holy. So therefore, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines votes 'no'. Garmisa. Garmisa votes 'no'.

Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Geo-Karis votes 'no'. Getty."

Getty: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Getty votes 'no'. Giglio. Giglio votes 'no'.
Giorgi."

Giorgi: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Giorgi votes 'no'. Greiman."

Greiman: "Just briefly to explain my vote, I think we are part of
a seven year...700 year history of development of parliamentary
forms and procedures and in the 17th and 18th Century the
residency requirements first came about so that the rotten
burro system in England would end. So that people who
did not live in an area had no touch with that area would
not represent that area. I think Peg Breslin has met
the...residency requirements and has that kind of connection
with that district and I will accordingly vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Greiman votes 'no'. Griesheimer. Griesheimer votes
'aye'. Hanahan. Hanahan votes 'aye'. Harris. Harris votes
'no'. Hart. Hart votes 'no'. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hoffman votes 'aye'. Holewinski. Holewinski votes
'aye'. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dan Houlihan votes 'no'. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jim Houlihan votes 'no'. Hoxsey. Hoxsey votes 'aye'.
Hudson. Hudson votes 'aye'. Huff."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, the Constitution, the question of residency and my
oath notwithstanding, I can not bring myself to be a party to
an action that equates, in my mind, that of the condemnation
of Joan of Arc, I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Huff votes 'no'. Huskey. Huskey votes 'aye'. Jacobs.
Jacobs votes 'no'. Jaffe. Jaffe votes 'no'. Johnson."

Johnson: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Johnson votes 'aye'. Dave Jones."



Jones: "Mr. Speaker, my heart says one thing, my head says another, the only way to solve that is vote 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dave Jones votes 'present'. Emil Jones. Pass. Kane. Kane votes 'aye'. Katz. Katz votes 'no'. Keats. Keats votes 'aye'. Kelly. Kelly votes 'no'. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kempiners votes 'aye'. Kent. Kent votes 'aye'. Klosak. Klosak votes 'aye'. Kornowicz, pass. Kosinski. Kosinski votes 'aye'. Kozubowski. Kozubowski votes 'aye'. Kucharski. Kucharski votes 'aye'. Lauer. Lauer votes 'aye'. Laurino. Laurino votes 'no'. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to address myself to this issue from two different standpoints. One, as a Democrat I should be voting 'no'. Preserve a seat in this House held by a very competent and capable Member. But in all reality, when we took our oath of office, each and every one of us, after we were elected by the people in our respected district, we still have to fulfill the obligation of the Constitution of the State of Illinois and the Constitution of the United States. And as I read Article IV, Section II, Paragraph C, it's very clear. And I would hope that every Member or every candidate for office would read that before they do become a candidate. It says, 'To be eligible to serve as a Member of the General Assembly a person must be a United States Citizen, at least 21 years old and for two years preceding his election or appointment; a resident of the district of which he is to represent. In the General Election following a redistricting of a candidate for the General Assembly may be elected for any district which contains a part of the district in which he resided at the time of redistricting and re-elected if a resident of a new district he represents for 18 months prior to reelection.' Ladies and Gentlemen, I've read all four reports. I've toiled with this question for some time. I've tried to find a way where I'd be able to help Mrs. Breslin



but as I read the Constitution and reviewing the facts that were presented before the Elections Committee, it was undisputed before the Committee that Mrs. Breslin had lived in Chicago and voted there for 10 elections. From November of 1970, including the April, 1975 election. Also and I think it was pointed out quite vividly by other Members that spoke on this issue, was the issue of residency on Parkway being a Captain in the 42nd Ward Regular Democratic Organization. And for that reason I should vote 'no', but I can't. I think that every Member of this General Assembly has an obligation to uphold the Constitution of the State of Illinois and the U.S. Constitution. I believe that it was proven in Committee, as far as her drivers license, state and federal income taxes, banking records, that this Lady was a resident in Chicago from 1970 to 1975. I've heard the smokescreen by some very distinguished attorneys here on this floor tell me about people who go to school, people who work for the Federal Government, but in turn there are provisions and they're satisfactory for a residency requirement. I don't believe the Lady has fulfilled the residency requirement as contained under the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And I don't believe any Member in this Body is above the Constitution of the State of Illinois or the U.S. Constitution and unfortunately, for these reasons, I have to vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Lechowicz votes 'aye'. Leinenweber. Leinenweber votes 'aye'. Leverenz. Leverenz votes 'aye'... Leverenz votes 'no'. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when I walked in the door to vote on this issue knowing what I knew then I intended to vote not to seat Mrs. Breslin. However, I have listened to debate and I must say that I think that no matter what the result is that the articulation, the analysis, the viewpoints that were expressed were absolutely outstanding and I think that the House has done just an excellent job. The Members, in terms of presenting their position. I must say that probably



it's one of the very few times I have genuinely been swayed by the debates. I think if I had voted early, I would have had to vote 'yes'. That was my initial inclination. However, being a lawyer I have certain prejudices and having listened to all the debate, I intend to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Levin votes 'no'. Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most of us, I'm sure, have gone through this and we're all saying it over and over. I sat here and changed my mind, I know, six times and I changed my mind twice in the last two minutes. I've... I was surprised when he said 'Lucco', because I didn't think it was my turn yet, it couldn't be...that moment of decision. I do think that our Constitution, the laws of our land, the laws of our state are made by ideas of men and women like those of us sitting here today. I know that we are governed by them and we must be governed by them. None of us is above the Constitution or the law, I have to vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Lucco votes 'aye'. Luft. Luft votes 'no'. Macdonald. Macdonald votes 'aye'. Madigan. Madigan votes 'no'. Madison. Madison votes 'present'. Mahar. Mahar votes 'aye'. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I've been a Member of this House for 15 years. I've always voted my mind and my heart and my soul. I've been my own man. I've also been Chairman of the Judiciary I Committee. That's the Committee that passes on the civil questions involving the law. Peg Breslin was a Member of that Committee. Many of the people who are voting to unseat her were also Members of that Committee. Not once was there an objection raised as to whether or not she had the right to vote on that Committee. Now I am not a killer, I guess I'm not an executioner, I've got to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mann votes 'no'. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Marovitz votes 'no'. Lynn Martin. Lynn Martin votes 'aye'. Peggy Smith Martin, pass. Matejek."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matejek."



Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a freshman Legislator I took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the State of Illinois. I feel I am bound by that oath and that no man or no woman is above the law and I have to vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Matejek votes 'aye'. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first I want to join...when he commended this Legislature and this House because never in my time have I heard such a good debate on any issue. And those who criticize the Legislature ought to just sit here and have to make up your mind on an issue like this. And the only thing I think about is that I wish that every issue were like this, where you could sway debate, could sway a vote based on what you hear in the House. I just wish every issue were like that. Now as to this matter, I think it's very important that we not only vote a certain way but we establish a precedence. If I were voting on the Majority Report it would be very simple. I would vote 'no'. Because I don't think waiver is an issue because even our rules say that any registered voter, any Member could establish a challenge as to qualifications. That could be very easy for me. Now after the matter, the Minority Report... the Minority Report goes into residency, that's not so easy. Because it isn't a clear cut case. We know of many people who live in Chicago, work in Chicago, they make their money there, but they actually live somewhere else, they're heart's somewhere else. It's not a clear cut case. It's a very difficult one in this particular instance. It's difficult for me personally because everybody knows that Jim Riccolo sat right behind me and we talked very often about many issues and we talked about the issue as to challenging Peg Breslin. Eleven people, it was said in the evidence here, didn't make that challenge. It would be different, I think, if those 11 people didn't know in their minds that she may not have been a resident. But they must of known that, I know Jim knew it, he didn't make the



challenge. And now it's brought before us. And now there's a question in my mind because I think that one can have their hearts somewhere else and that may be their resident. Truly when she filed she was telling people, 'I intend to live there, I intend to make that my home. It has been my home, it's going to be my home again.' And there had been evidence that during the interim that that was her home. And I can not vote 'yes' unless it were clear cut that that wasn't her residency. But I want to make sure that the record here shows that we, as a Body, can rule on residency. but as to me, on this case, I think it isn't clear cut. Therefore, I must vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Matijevich votes 'no'. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As an elected Representative of the 37th District, the 38th at one time was in the old 36th and I campaigned in that area. It's still very close to the Illinois Valley area. I know for a fact both candidates took their cases to the people of the 38th District, debated them fully and the people from that area did their democratic duty and they voted for the candidates of their choice. My father told me many years ago, if you have something to offer or an idea to be presented, present it before the people, on a ballot, let them make the choice. I believe she has done so. And to disenfranchise the citizens of the 38th because of the virtue of their vote and if we were to deny the seat, we would be creating an anarchy. I can't do that. I've got to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino votes 'no'. McAuliffe. McAuliffe votes 'aye'. McAvoy, pass. McBroom. McBroom votes 'no'. McClain. McClain votes 'no'. McCourt. McCourt votes 'aye'. McGrew. McGrew votes 'aye'. McLendon. McLendon votes 'no'. McMaster. McMaster votes 'aye'. McPike. McPike votes 'no'. Meyer. Meyer votes 'aye'. Miller. Miller votes 'aye'. Molloy. Molloy votes 'no'. Mudd."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one time that I wish that I was an expert on the Election Committee. And like many of the Members in the House, I tend to rely on people whom I feel have got the expertise in these matters. I rely on Representative Bluthardt, Representative Laurino, several of the other Members of the Elections Committee, listen to their debate and try to make a decision. I'm sure you can appreciate that this time it's very difficult to do. I think that there are some other qualifications that come into play when running for State Representative, one of those are that you identify with a certain area and the people in that area and you run from a particular area because of this. I also believe that some of the mechanics following this decision have to be examined. Thousands of people who it's obvious were aware because of the debate here today that there was a question of residency in this district, voted to elect Peg Breslin as their Representative. One hundred and seventy-seven people can decide today to unseat her. But three to five people will decide who will replace her. And in all conscience I feel that I have to rely on the people that she presented her case to in the district and vote 'no' at this time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mudd votes 'no'. Mugalian. Mugalian votes 'aye'. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mulcahey votes 'no'. Murphy. Murphy votes 'no'. Nardulli. Nardulli votes 'no'. Neff. Neff votes 'aye'. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining... O'Brien votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "O'Brien votes 'no'. O'Daniel. O'Daniel votes 'no'. Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I was donning my judicial robes over the last several hours my mind was mentally transported to the circumstances that raged under debate here for the past several hours. And it occurred



to me that, as I looked over to where the jury box should be that it was strangely empty. That in fact the jury had retired November, 1976 and cast their vote for the present holder of the Democratic seat, the Minority seat in the 38th District of the State of Illinois. And for those simple reasons it occurred to me that the lights have long since been turned out in that courtroom. The key has been turned and everyone's went home. The people of the 38th had cast their vote November of '76 and I concur in their choice and I vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pechous votes 'no'. Peters."

Peters: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Peters votes 'aye'. Pierce, pass. Polk. Polk votes 'aye'. Porter. Porter votes 'aye'. Pouncey. Pouncey votes 'no'. Pullen."

Pullen: "With deep personal regret I must vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pullen votes 'aye'. Reed. Reed votes 'aye'. Reilly. Reilly votes 'aye'. Richmond. Richmond votes 'no'. Rigney, pass. Robinson. Robinson votes 'no'. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to explain my vote, I'm not sure it's proper in this instance. But I would like to congratulate the Elections Committee and the Members of the General Assembly and especially the Committee for the excellent reports that they've put out and personally thank them for their hard work and efforts that they've put into this report. I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ryan votes 'aye'. Sandquist. Sandquist votes 'no'. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Satterthwaite votes 'no'. Schisler. Schisler votes 'no'. Schlickman. Schlickman votes 'aye'. Schneider. Schneider votes 'aye'. Schoeberlein, pass. Schunaman. Schuneman votes 'aye'. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sevcik votes 'aye'. Sharp. Sharp votes 'aye'. Shumpert."



Shumpert votes 'no'. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think during my four terms in Springfield this probably has been the most difficult vote to have to cast because as so many have said, there are many different issues that are overriding it. But I think, reading the four reports and analyzing the information that the one area that concerns me the most in arriving at my decision is the area of voting. In the case of my good friend, Representative Deuster, when he chose to go to Washington D.C. he continued to vote in his district. In the case of Governor Bond, he continued to vote in Missouri, in the case of Mrs. Breslin she chose to vote in the City of Chicago. She signed an affidavit to that effect that she was a resident. It is with a great deal of sorrow that I have to cast an 'aye' vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Simms votes 'aye'. Skinner. Skinner votes 'aye'. Stanley. Stanley votes 'aye'. Stearney, pass. Steczo. Steczo votes 'no'. E.G. Steele. E.G. Steele votes 'aye'. C. M. Stiehl. C. M. Stiehl votes 'aye'. Stuffle. Stuffle votes 'no'. Sumner."

Sumner: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sumner votes 'aye'. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I happened to have served in this Session during the time that Jim Riccolo did. His office was right next to mine. And when I hear someone say that he did not know what was going on, that's not true. Riccolo knew, because I talked to him about it. I told him he had a tough fight, he was fighting a Lady. I have had that same type of fight and it's a difficult job. He chose ...he did and he lost and I therefore am going to help the people of the 38th District and cast my 'no' vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Taylor votes 'no'. Telcser. Telcser votes 'aye'. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I heard the testimony on this case as well and reading the Constitution and with regard to



residency, if I was to run for office at that time, I think I would have ran in the 13th District and I would have been qualified to run there so therefore, I have to vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich votes 'aye'. Tipsword. Tipsword votes 'no'. Totten."

Totten: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Totten votes 'aye'. Tuerk. Tuerk votes 'aye'. Van Duyne. Van Duyne, pass. Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been torn, as many of us have here, in the last four or five hours here and when I hear the lawyers get up and talk and the others about their children away at school, I try to weigh the decision of the laymen who expressed the Constitution. And I swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the State of Illinois and therefore my conscience tells me to vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vitek votes 'aye'. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have had attorneys on this House floor express views on both sides. As a laymen I have to make a decision on what is Constitutional. The Constitution clearly states that the requirements are two years. And I'm sure that the people of the 38th District were not aware that Peggy Breslin did not meet those requirements, as we in the General Assembly did not know that she did not meet the requirements until it was brought to our attention. I'm not questioning Peggy Breslin's qualifications. I think she is a most capable person to sit in this General Assembly. But I have to vote on whether she met the Constitutional requirements. I feel she did not. There...I must vote 'yes'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Von Boeckman votes 'aye'."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I think you ought to advise the photographers that the light is not on."



Speaker Redmond: "I have told them that. I told them that before.
Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Waddell."

Waddell: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Waddell votes 'aye'. Wall. Wall votes 'no'.
Walsh."

Walsh: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Walsh votes 'aye'. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I think we are operating under a government of
laws, not of man and it's time that we must stand up and
be counted. I vote 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Wikoff votes 'aye'. Willer."

Willer: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Willer votes 'aye'. Williams. Williams votes 'aye'.
Winchester. Winchester votes 'aye'. Wolf. Wolf votes 'aye'.
Younge. Younge votes 'no'. Yourell. Yourell votes 'aye'.
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker votes 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Does anyone who has not voted desire to vote?
Representative Pierce? Pierce votes 'no'. Representative
Peggy Smith Martin."

Martin: "I'd like to be recorded as 'present' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Lady as 'present'. Anyone else desire
to vote? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I think the procedure we've always followed is the
Clerk goes once more through the absentees and then where there's
any changes..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Body, of all
the votes I've had to cast in my three terms in this General
Assembly, I believe this is the hardest. If I were to follow
the dictates of the lawyers who argued intent or the lawyers
who argued about roots, I would be more inclined to vote 'aye'.
If I were to follow the Constitution as I believe it, then I



would vote 'no'. It's a very difficult vote to cast but there has been only one convincing argument on this floor that would dictate to me as to how I should vote. Before I was sworn into this Body we had an Orientation Session and the then President of the Senate, Cécil Partee, said 'You belong to a very unique group.' We've had some tremendous battles on this House floor, but when one of the speakers on this floor is saying, 'You have never witnessed a Member being expelled from this Body.' I know I should follow the dictates of the Constitution, but I don't want to witness it. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, my heart goes out for Breslin. Switch me from 'aye' to 'nay'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'nay'. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, having voted 'present', I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Any Member desire to change his vote? Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I was among the first of any Democrats that was going to vote and being the Majority Leader's running mate he chose that he wished that I did not vote because it might look like he wanted Mrs. Breslin thrown out of here because I was going to vote 'yes'. But after listening to arguments, particularly of the one Member from Skokie indicating that Mrs. Breslin actually had lived in this area so long and she merely was away at school, I really think that she does fulfill the residence requirement. She was gone away for school. She was there maybe a little bit longer but with such a close vote, with such a close vote I don't want to be the one to throw her out of here and so I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty votes 'no'. Any Member desire to change his vote? The Clerk will take the record."



Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well this has been a very difficult vote for me. I went upstairs for a Conference Committee and listened to the debate on a speaker up there. I had a very similar situation as a Member of the Constitutional Convention. Why I ran against someone in my district that was residing in Chicago, had his ties back in the 35th District, came back there to run against me. We made quite an issue of it in that campaign. But nevertheless, the voters in our district, despite the issue still voted to send that man to the Constitutional Convention. I think we have something very similar here. I think the evidence is against Mrs. Breslin, but in all honesty I don't think at this hour that I can throw someone out of the House. For that reason, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative Emil Jones, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jones: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently did not push my 'no' vote so will you record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "You're recorded as 'no'. Any other Members desire to change his vote? Representative O'Brien, for what purpose do you rise?"

O'Brien: "Change my vote, am I allowed to explain it?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

O'Brien: "I'm changing my vote, Mr. President...Mr. Speaker and I'd like to explain why I'm changing my 'no' vote to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't believe the rules provide for that, Representative O'Brien. You can change your vote but you can't explain it again. Is there objection to him explaining his vote? Objections have been raised. Representative O'Brien, do you desire to change your vote to 'present', is that correct?"

O'Brien: "And explain it."

Speaker Redmond: "It's not in the rules..."

O'Brien: "When I'm elected by the people from a district within the State of Illinois, this is one of the most important issues that has come before this Body and I would like to explain my vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien, you've explained your vote once and I don't believe the rules so provide. Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the way you've conducted this meeting here today has been very, very fine and I don't think that now is the time to cause any disruption. I think the rules are very, very clear and I'd think we would follow them."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question... Representative Stearney, are you seeking recognition."

Stearney: "Yes, this here vote has been very difficult for me because the Members of this House know that last Session I had an election contest and it's difficult for me to vote against someone. However, the issue is of such importance, let me relate certain facts to you. Peter C. Granada sat here for over 35 years and when he died we had a naked power play in Cook County by the Republican County Chairman at that time, in which he installed an individual who is sitting in the balcony here. And it was only because of the action of this House by Representatives Bluthardt and Collins and my good friend, Representative Charlie Fleck, that something was done. And if no action had been taken by the House at that time I would not probably have gotten here. And like Charles Fleck said before that Committee, that Election Committee, he said, 'Let the investigation be conducted in such a way and like Jack, let no one be spared.' So it becomes incumbent upon me to vote and vote in such a way to protect myself and protect the Constitution and to give it meaning and reluctantly, very reluctantly, I have to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "A point Sir, of parliamentary inquiry. Under...in Rule 78 are there any things that would be filed with the Clerk as... prior to or with...at the time of the report...Proceedings, transcripts and have they been filed if there are? There seems to be, I'm reading it quickly an allusion in one of



the subparagraphs of the filing of record and transcripts. I wonder if that had been complied with or if I'm correct in reading it and if it has been complied with."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if the votes are there, they're there. If they're not there, they're not there. This is a tough matter for all of us. We've got a couple of things to do tonight yet and the agony, frankly, is getting to me and I'm sure it is to a lot of Members in the House here. Let us just not prolong it. Let us do what we're doing or have got to do. You're going to change, change your vote or whatever you're going to do but get it over with."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. What is the count? On this question there's 91 'aye' and 74 'no'. The motion carries. The Minority Report is adopted and the seat in which Representative Peg Breslin was elected from the 38th Legislative District is declared vacant. Mrs. Breslin. Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and former fellow Members. Needless to say, this is a most unpleasant moment for me. But before I leave I must tell you that I have enjoyed many things about being here. I've enjoyed your friendship, your encouragement, your taking the time to explain things to me and to teach me the legislative process. I think you've done a pretty good job of teaching me the legislative process because you've helped me pass six Bills out of both Houses of this General Assembly and they're all on their way to the Governor. In addition, I have introduced a Bill for a 14 million dollar bridge in my community and was obviously persuasive enough anyway in Committee to have the Governor put it in his budget. And for that I am deeply appreciative and so are the people of the community of Ottawa. They thank you and I thank you. Beyond this there is one piece of legislation which I introduced, which I am very much interested in. It deals with changing the



contributory negligence standards used in Illinois tort cases to a more equitable standard, in my opinion, that of comparative negligence. It's now before Mr. Mann's Committee. It's a significant proposal which two other Members also introduced Bills on and I hope that these Bills will be worked on so that we come out with a good Committee Bill for your consideration. I'm sorry I'll not be in here to participate in those celebrations but rest assured that I am not bitter. Life is much too short to be bitter. I've enjoyed being here and I thank you for the privilege of serving with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Be a fifteen minute recess. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I sincerely mean it when I say, may Peg Breslin go back home, run for reelection, become a martyr like Art Bidwill did, run for reelection once she is constitutionally qualified and may she serve down here as long as Art Bidwill did."

Speaker Redmond: "Fifteen minutes. Representative Cunningham, your clock is on the bum again. It's six thirty. We'll be back at six thirty. It's now six fifteen. Hey, I did not turn on the lights, so there will be no taking of pictures. If this continues, we will discontinue taking pictures at all. Giglio, Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it the intention of the Chair to work after the fifteen minutes all night without a break?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, yes."

Giglio: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "But be sure you don't take anymore than fifteen minutes."

House in recess



Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Hall: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee Report and requests a Second Conference Committee to consider the difference between the two Houses in regard to Senate Amendments to House 822. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their Amendments to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 496. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted and attached the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 332. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted and attached the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 337. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted and attached the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 339. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted and attached the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 325. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur..."

Speaker Redmond: "Dave Epstein on the floor? Doorkeeper, will you see



if Represen... or that Dave Epstein is, Parliamentarian, is out there an ask him to come in? Proceed."

Clerk Hall: "The Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1357. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1301. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate, Mr. Speaker... by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1342. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 997, which Amendments as follows: House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 997. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1071 and I'm further directed to inform the House that the Senate requests a First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a First Conference Committee to consider the difference between the two Houses in regard to the House Amendment to Senate Bill 1023 and I'm further instructed to inform the House of Representatives the Committee on Committees of the



Senate has appointed as such... on the part of the Senate. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for a First Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to Amendments to Senate Bill 880. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for the First Conference Committee to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to House Amendments to Senate Bill 596. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has receded to the request of the House of Representatives for the First Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to House Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 964. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for the First Conference Committee to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to House Amendment to Senate Bill 881. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred in the House in the adoption of Amendment to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 152. I'm also directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House, adoption of the following Amendment. House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 152. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.



Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill #1236. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 1298. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendment #3 and 4 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1308. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1338. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in their adoption of their Amendment #2 and 3 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1358. Concurred in by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of their Amendments #1, 5, 6, 7 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 1359. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in their adoption of Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. Senate Bill 216. Concurred in by the Senate, June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,



Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted and attached the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1062. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the attached First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1001. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted and passed the First Conference Committee to Senate Bill 543. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted and attached the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2089. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has receded from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. House Bill 2101. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the attached First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 419. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted and attached the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1253. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, to wit. House Bill 641. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything else, Mr. Clerk? Proceed."

Clerk Hall: "Conference Committee will meet this evening, June 30, 1977, the following times in Room 212. House Bill 1033 at seven p.m., table 7. House Bill 1062, seven p.m., table 8. And at seven thirty p.m., House Bill 973 in Room 400, table 4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Conference Committee on House Bill 1736 will be held in about three or four minutes in 212. The House Members - Matijevich, Kozubowski... I'm sorry, Matijevich, Darrow, Polk and Cunningham. And we should be able to get it out of the way in about three or four minutes."

Clerk Hall: "On House Bill 973, Conference Committee is at seven thirty p.m. in Room 400 and the Members are Representative McClain, E.M. Barnes, Jim Houlihan, Gaines and Sandquist. And on House Bill 1062, there'll be a Conference Committee at seven p.m. in Room 212, table 8 and the Members to that are Representatives Capparelli, Greiman, Waddell and Friedrich. On House Bill 1033 there'll be a Conference Committee at seven p.m. in Room 212, table #7. The Members of that Committee are Kozubowski, Byers, Cunningham and Winchester. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just would like to request that I not be appointed to anymore Conference Committee unless I'm notified and given the courtesy of when a meeting is supposed to be held. Somebody just recently came to me and asked me to sign a Conference Committee Report for Senate Bill 964, probably a very good Bill and probably a very good Conference Report. I'm not going to sign anything that I'm not invited to attend the meeting on."

Speaker Redmond: "Light is not on. Taking of pictures is not permitted until the light is on. There's been a rumor that NBC took pictures during that election contest and if they did, why, it wasn't authorized and I think in all fairness, they should... I'm going to suggest you destroy the film if you did because it's a violation of the rules of the House. Dillon Smith, I know, is a man of great honor and... you did not tape during the Breslin thing? Okay. Representative Yourell."



Yourell: "Request a Roll Call on that."

Speaker Redmond: "Former Member of the House, former Comptroller, Assistant Attorney General George Lindberg. Former Member, now Senator San Maragos to announce the meeting of the Revenue Committee. Representative Telcser is recognized. Representative Mann, do you have a meeting of Judiciary I scheduled? Seven o'clock tomorrow morning? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I've heard rumors that House Members have gone over to the Senate and have been met with locked doors and have not been able to gain entrance into that cavity and I wonder what the position of the Chair is relative to Senate Members on the floor of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "We welcome them. You know if you turn people away, they have no learning process. But if you let them come in and they see how nice and gentle and kind we are, why maybe they'll..."

Yourell: "Why don't you send a message over to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, to tell them that we would appreciate being a part of that learning process?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vitek, on Waddell's horn."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, maybe I can clarify that question of Yourell's. I also tried to get in there but at that moment they were discussing a memorial to Dan Dougherty and they didn't want any interruptions, so they resolved that question and now you can get in."

Speaker Redmond: "Now we don't wanna'. We don't wanna'. You tell them we don't want to go in there. The Order of Concurrence, House Bill 1. Representative Marovitz has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1. Voice vote. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Ayes have it. Who's that? Greg? Mark says it's his father."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Gaines, you're wanted in Room 400 for a Conference Committee meeting on House Bill 973. Room 400, table 4, Representative Gaines."

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2368. Representative Ryan, I understand that you want to move to concur in Senate Amendment 1 and



refuse to concur in 2, is that correct?"

Ryan: "Give me just a minute, Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what the program is. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental Calendar #3. Concurrence, is that it? Representative Telcser. I can't see Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "What Bill is this? Oh, this is yours, George. 496 is fine."

Speaker Redmond: "496."

Telcser: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it? Supplemental Calendar 3. Supplemental Calendar #3, on Nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 496. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 496 is the Capital Development Board Bill. The Senate has refused to concur with the House Amendments to Senate Bill 496 and so, Mr. Speaker, I do now move that the House refuse to recede to the House Amendment to Senate Bill 496 and a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede... what Amendments were there? All of them?"

Telcser: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "To all of the House Amendments and request a Conference Committee. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The House refused to recede from the House Amendment and a Conference Committee is requested. 1301, Representative Brummer. House will be in order. Representative Rich Brummer. Brummer, 1301. Representative Flinn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, some of us don't seem to have the Supplemental #3 Calendar. Could we have a few extra copies back here?"

Speaker Redmond: "Page, Page, will you distribute the Supplemental Calendar? Well, they need some back there. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Senate did not concur in House Amendment #1. I would move that we refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and request a Conference Committee



be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Brummer, what was your motion?"

Brummer: "That the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 and request a Conference Committee. 1 and 2, request a Conference Committee. Just 1, Mr. Clerk. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the House refuses to recede. Conference Committee will be appointed... requested. What do you want to do with Amendment 2, Representative? Does it make any difference now that there's a Conference Committee being appointed?"

Brummer: "Amendment #2 is fine with me. I don't know what the procedure is when you concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Doesn't make any..."

Brummer: "Nonconcur in both, might as well..."

Speaker Redmond: "Might as well amend that motion to nonconcur in both Amendments 1 and 2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carries. 1342, Bartulis. 1342, what do you want to do with that? Representative Bartulis moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1342. Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question about this."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Bowman's phone there."

Hart: "'Junie', I hear rumblings around the halls that this Bill's going to be used as a vehicle to increase the license fee."

Bartulis: "License fee? No, Sir."

Hart: "Thank you very much."

Bartulis: "It's just between... there's some clean up language and Amendments on... between fish and fish eggs."

Hart: "I couldn't think of it being in any better hands than yours."

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

Skinner: "Yes, I'd like the Gentleman to know we've got another vehicle."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1342. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1342 and a Conference Committee is reported. Representative Deavers, 1367. Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we recede from House Amendment 1 and concur or move... what do I do next?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well... the Gentleman has moved that the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1367. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman tell us what..."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the Amendment, will ya'?"

Deavers: "We're taking the nonvoting member off of that Liquor Commission."

Leinenweber: "Hurray."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1367. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93, 94 'aye' and 8 'no' and the House recedes from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1367. On the Order of Concurrence, the original Calendar, appears 1833. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1833 with the Senate Amendment would provide for the transfer of \$19.5 million from the Metropolitan Fair and Exposition Authority and Reconstruction Fund to the General Revenue Fund of the State of Illinois, providing for the remainder to remain in the Metropolitan Fair Fund and for \$4.8 million to be deposited in the fund starting next year to pay for the rehabilitation of the Donnelly Building. I move for concurrence with the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I can do no more than wait for the microphone to be turned on, Sir. I wonder if the Sponsor could tell us if this Bill



has, as was reported earlier, the ability for the Metropolitan Exposition Authority to use this money to fill in deficits, operating deficits?"

Madigan: "The purpose of allowing the remainder of the money to remain in the fund is to pay for the rehabilitation of the Donnelly Building which is estimated will cost approximately eighteen million dollars and also to pay for the cost of the certain improvements to be made at the McCormick Place."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very important Amendment here and I wish we could get the... you know, the..."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be in order."

Ebbesen: "I can't hear a thing."

Speaker Redmond: "House will be in order. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Well, I don't want to interrupt the House Bill, but, you know, we do a lot of things quickly here and before a message goes to the Senate, on the last Bill, Senate Bill 1367, many of us weren't awake as to what is going on. So I intend having voted on the prevailing side on that when we did recede, would leave... would like to reconsider that vote and I just want the Bill held till we get back to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, all right. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I would object to the hearing of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1833. On this side, it has not been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "The reason is there has been no Conference Committee Report. We're on the matter of Concurrence, page 3 in the original Calendar."

Schlickman: "I need new glasses, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Representative Schlickman can have the 8:30 appointment in the morning. I'll be glad to take care of him."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you have any other health deliver... health care delivery service purveyors that would have other appointments for Representative Schlickman? He may need more. Anything further?"



The question... Representative Madigan has moved that the House concur... Representative Mann."

Mann: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mann: "Mike, as I understand it, two and a half million dollars is being appropriated now... as I understand it, two and a half million dollars is being appropriated now for McCormick Place. Now, this additional money in the amount of what, some four million dollars, is being... Yes, Sir, go ahead."

Madigan: "4.8."

Mann: "4.8 is being put into the Exposition Fund for the purpose of additional repairs to Donnelly?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Mann: "And you estimate it'll take about eighteen million? Then we're talking about a four year period for the remodeling and rehabilitation of that building?"

Madigan: "Approximately."

Mann: "So we can't use it in the meantime?"

Madigan: "The plan is to finance the remodeling through the selling of a bond issue."

Mann: "Well, if you're going to sell it for a bond issue, what do you need the money for now, to transfer it in there?"

Madigan: "To support the sale of the bond issue to provide a buttress which will provide for the salability of the bonds on this market."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? Representative Skinner."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me speak to this please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mann: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, it is not entirely clear... Ladies and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Mann: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we're talking here not only about two and a half million dollars, but we're talking about over four million dollars to be put into the fund that is not specified. There's no specification for the use of the money and that money could go into the General Revenue Fund to be used for other



purposes. I urge you not to concur because we're setting up a fund for which we do not know its purpose because it isn't specified. It could be for a stadium, it could be for a lot of different reasons. I urge we do not concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, before Representative Matijevich rose for the purpose of obfuscation of the issue, I was asking Representative Madigan some questions and I now have some more. I wonder if I might continue?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "I thought the part of this deal that the Governor was coming through with which made sense was two and a half million dollars for the renovation of the R.R. Donnelly Building. Now am I to understand that in addition to the two and a half million dollars, there is an additional maybe fifteen and a half million dollars that's going to be spent on renovation for a total of eighteen million dollars?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today the McCormick Place which is one of the largest and most successful exposition halls in the United States is faced with the loss of several major shows because of the limit... space limitations at the McCormick Place Building. There are two major shows scheduled for next year and the McCormick Place has been told that if they do not obtain additional space for these shows, that those shows will move outside the City of Chicago and, therefore, outside of the State of Illinois. The loss of spendable money at these shows is estimated to be forty-five to fifty million dollars a year. Naturally, that's spendable money spent within the State of Illinois will reap sales tax revenues, hotel tax revenues and any other miscellaneous tax revenue. Therefore, as the operating board has proposed that the bonds... Donnelly Building which was a gift to the McCormick Place and certain portions of the McCormick Place be remodeled in order to provide the space needs which the major shows all across the country now require and if not made available will result in the loss of forty-five to fifty million dollars in spendable money within



the State of Illinois."

Skinner: "Well, Representative, I don't think you've answered my question. I'm asking for the total cost of the renovation projects. Is it eighteen million dollars?"

Madigan: "The total cost is estimated between eighteen and twenty million dollars."

Skinner: "All right, so the money that we're talking about here is not going to be going toward operational deficits of McCormick Place. It's going to be going for bricks and mortar and paint and glass and stuff like that."

Madigan: "That is the plan."

Skinner: "All right, I guess my only misunderstanding was that I thought the renovation would only cost two and a half million dollars and now we're suddenly up to eighteen, but I think I'd rather have it go on bricks and mortar than operating deficits. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Tipsword: "Representative Madigan, as I read this, am I correct in that each year with... from fiscal year... including fiscal year 1979 and then each fiscal year thereafter, an amount of four million to eight hundred thousand dollars is to be paid into the Exposition Fund or the Reconstruction Fund, excuse me?"

Madigan: "Well, Mr. Tipsword, that's how I read the Amendments."

Tipsword: "And then, that money is to be thereafter appropriated by the General Assembly each and every year? This is without time limit from now on for time immemorial."

Madigan: "That's correct, subject to appropriation of the General Assembly."

Tipsword: "So that there will be no end to this cigarette tax if we pass this?"

Madigan: "If the General Assembly appropriates the money."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Jim Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, since this is an additional amount of money,



I wonder if we could have leave to have Representative Telcser's remarks on a former Bill read into the record at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "Leave is granted. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've had various forms of this Bill and I know that McCormick Place is in... maybe needs some money up there, but we have buildings in downstate Illinois and in my home town of Highland and other places and I know there's buildings in Litchfield and East St. Louis and Edwardsville and Collinsville and we certainly don't get any state tax dollars from the Cigarette Fund that I know of to renovate those. And I think that if we would all hold off this, that maybe we could get something for every city in the state to renovate buildings in our own towns. We have shows in our town also of different kinds, not the size they have in McCormick Place, but I think that would only be fair. So they're going to take cigarette money, tax money from downstate and go... it's going to be used in Chicago. I think this could be used in some other method that would be much better and I would recommend a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1429. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Wait a minute, wait a minute. It's 1833, pardon me. 1833. You're right. Have all voted who wished? Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we have debated this at some length several times this year and I think that it's been cast pretty good that it is an investment and not a gift. That it's going to return some money to us. And I see we have the votes and I'm glad since this is probably the last time I'll have to deal with it."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye', 95 'aye', 32 'no'. Representative Byers has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I can surely see the question of verification by people here in the House, but it's pretty hard..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."



Mudd: "It's pretty hard to carry on Conference Committees on 70 Bills and have all the Members on the floor of the House. And this adds... this proposition's been before the House, been verified on a number of occasions and we keep this same thing going on every time it comes before the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Adams 'aye'. Steczo 'aye'. Representative Harris, you seeking recognition?"

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'. I voted as 'aye'..."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that if we just poll the absentees and you indicate when your name is called how you desire to be voted, we can save some time. Representative Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Mr. Speaker, please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Guess you didn't hear so good. Vote him 'aye'. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bowman, Rich Brummer, Campbell, Chapman, Christensen, Collins, Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. Daniels."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Teuster, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Hoffman, Jacobs, Katz, Kornowicz, Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Kosinski 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leinenweber."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madison, Lynn Martin, Peggy Smith Martin, McAvoy, McGrew, McMaster, McPike, Mugalian, Neff, O'Daniel."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since there's a verification on this Bill, I'd like to ask leave of the House to be verified so I can go to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Representative Harris."

Harris: "Speaker, I'd like to be verified so I can go to Conference



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Harris be verified? No objections, he will be verified. How do you vote? Aye?"

Harris: "My vote is an 'aye' vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "He changes his vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Satterthwaite."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler 'aye'. O'Daniel 'aye'.

McGrew 'aye'. Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as 'aye' and would like to be verified please."

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified? Go to a Conference. Representative Katz. Representative Schlickman wants to know why you want to be verified now and leave the floor."

Katz: "I have several matters in Conference Committees, Mr. Speaker, and I'm trying to take care of a lot of official business and other business."

Schlickman: "But not official business?"

Katz: "No, that's not true, Mr. Schlickman, and I think that you are rather making a mountain out of a molehill."

Schlickman: "Conference Committee?"

Katz: "I have three of them."

Schlickman: "You're cute."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you."

Schlickman: "Good-bye."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty. Representative Getty 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein, Simms, E.G. Steele, Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Redmond: "Van Duyne? Not here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Wikoff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Winchester and Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that? Representative Wolf 'aye'. 109 'ayes', how many nos? 109 'ayes' and 31 'nos'. Representative Reed



'aye'. 110, 110. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, in lieu of all the people getting on the other side over there, it proves my theory and I withdraw my verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Request for verification has been withdrawn. Representative Matijevich. The House... on the Gentleman's motion the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1429. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, did you declare this Bill passed? You declared the wrong number, Mr. Speaker:"

Speaker Redmond: "1833."

Madigan: "Is what?"

Speaker Redmond: "That the House concurred in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1833. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we do a lot of things quickly here and we... it... oh, I'm sorry. I move to re... having voted on the prevailing side by which House Bill 1833, we concurred to the Amendment #1, I move to reconsider that vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich has... those in... all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carries."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Yes, now, that just proves how quickly we do things around here. But in further evidence to that, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a little while ago, we receded to House Amendment #1 to 1367 and the House quickly voted on that and having voted on the prevailing side by which we receded from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1367, I move to reconsider the vote by which..."

Speaker Redmond: "Let me see that motion."

Matijeich: "By which that we receded."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, will you give me that motion? Is that the one that was filed in writing? Representative Matijeich, having voted on the prevailing side by which the House voted to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1367, moves to reconsider the vote. Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your inquiry."

J. Houlihan: "Since we moved to recede and that was final action, there were the required number of votes, I assume that Bill is on it's way as other Bills have moved quickly and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is the Bill in the custody of the House? Yes, the Bill is still in the House."

J. Houlihan: "I move that that motion lie upon the table, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a good way to kill my motion except I want to say, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, you're a grown boy now."

Skinner: "Point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "You're a grown boy. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Well, I know Representative Skinner likes to vote intelligently on every issue. You cannot vote intelligently by a mere tabling motion and you know that. And I believe it is debateable. It is debateable. You ask the Parliamentarian if it isn't. And I say, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, will you be quiet? I'll call



on you. Mr. Doorkeeper, Mr. Doorkeeper. If you want to be escorted out of here, you just persist."

Matijevec: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, on every particular time we've had a motion like this, we've allowed the maker of the motion to explain the motion. On every occasion. I don't want that denied to me and I say that on two occasions here in the House by substantial majorities, we have said that a retail liquor license..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "On two separate occasions, we have allowed... by significant majorities in the House, both by the Amendment, House Amendment #1 and the passage of the Bill, we have said that a liquor licensee ought to have a nonvoting right of voice on the Illinois Liquor Control Commission. By substantial majorities we've said that. Why should we recede? Because the Senate has said, no we shouldn't? We've done what we think is right. On many occasions we've said every other profession ought to have a voting right. We're not asking for too much and I think we acted hastily. We act hastily when some Members are at Conference Committees. We can't be here on the House floor to fight for what we think is right for people. And I think that the proper vote now is to reconsider that vote and vote against this motion to table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, now that the Gentleman has stopped shilling for the liquor industry, I wonder if I may ask a point of order?"

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Skinner: "Is the motion to table debateable?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not debateable, but he has a right to present his motion. Everybody was climbing down his throat. ...the motion."

Skinner: "Your evenness of decisions is incredible."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you. Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "On a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have heard former



Members of this House when returning to this Body and visiting with it, stating that the finest period of their lives is when they served in this Body. I have also heard, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, those same individuals stating that this was the most deliberative Body in the world. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are a parliamentary Body. And as a parliamentary Body, we are to be disciplined. And in being disciplined, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we are subject to control and regulation by the Speaker under the authority by which he has been invested by his election. Mr. Speaker, I have served under a number of Speakers and I must say that you have been the fairest of them. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that no Member, that no Member speak unless he or she has been recognized. I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that when a Member is speaking by your recognition, that that person be allowed to speak uninterrupted. I think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we are at the most crucial, critical time of the 80th General Assembly. And if we are to act as we are expected to act, we will acknowledge your authority and we will acknowledge the right of other Members of the House. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you very much, Representative Schlickman. Representative Matijevich has moved that having voted on the prevailing side by which the House voted to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1367 that that vote be reconsidered. Those in favor... those in favor of the motion to... was there a motion to table that? Representative Houlihan moves that Representative Matijevich's motion lie on the table. The question is on Representative Houlihan's motion to lie it on the table. Those in favor, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me put some records straight here. Now, we had this Bill up one night about a month or six weeks ago and we had a full debate on this. And this House voted to reject it. Then one night, one night while we were here in a... in an all-night Session



where we were having food in the Speaker's office and the Minority Leader's office, this same Bill was put back in Amendment to a shell Bill and it was passed out when nobody was on the floor or hardly anybody was on the floor. There was no overwhelming vote on this. And then the other night, it happened to be voted out when I was not here. This is a very bad Bill. And I urge you to vote to table this Amendment because... table this Bill. There is no reason to have a liquor licensee sitting in on matters that he's going to judge on, whether he's voting or not. This is not just a board like you have at universities. This is not just a board of running things. This is a quasi-judicial Body and to have somebody who's going to be possibly judged sitting in there, is a bad precedent to set. Now, we had, I think this is a way we can kill it, so let's table this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'aye', 70 'no'. Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, if we're going to proceed in this fashion, I'd like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Keats, for what purpose do you rise?"

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Perhaps this is a problem of a freshman, but there are a group of us sitting here talking. We know how we want to vote, but we'll be dogged if we know if that's a 'yes' or a 'no' vote. And could we find out, get an explanation. We know what we want, but we don't know which way to vote to get what we want."

Speaker Redmond: "This was a motion to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the House receded from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1367. Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson. Johnson."

Johnson: "I would ask that the Chair declare that request dilatory. It seems the preface to the statement was that had nothing to do with verifying or absentees. It had to do with other purposes and I would ask the Chair to rule that dilatory at this point in our proceedings."



Speaker Redmond: "Not till five minutes till twelve. Representative Ewell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Vote me 'aye', Mr. Speaker. My switch is..."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Bennett."

Bennett: "Aye."

Speaker Redmond: "Aye. Keats."

Keats: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Mautino, 'no'. Caldwell, 'no'... 'aye'. Wait a minute now. How far did you get? Caldwell... huh? Wait a minute now. What's the last one you got?"

Keats: "Keats."

Speaker Redmond: "Everybody be quiet. Representative Keats, 'no'. Representative Caldwell, 'aye'. Representative Schlickman, I just listened to what you said. And if you'll just let me proceed along here, why, we'll get to everybody. Representative Madison, 'aye'. Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Raise your hands. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, might I just suggest first of all, it's difficult to hear. Second, it's getting tough to breathe with all the people that are here on the House floor. If the Chair might order the Sargeant-at-Arms at least to clear a path here so that the smoke can get through or something."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll take care of that when we get through with this. Anyone else? Representative Boucek. Boucek."

Boucek: "No, change mine to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Schlickman. Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, could we dump this Roll Call and start over so we know where we are?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think maybe... what do you say, Mr. Clerk? I've been advised by the Clerk that we should dump this Roll Call. The question... dump the Roll Call. The question is on



Representative Houlihan's motion that Representative Matijevec's motion to reconsider lie on the table. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Mulcahey, 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 69 'aye' and 72 'no' and the motion to table fails. Now, revert to... Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, this is 69 voting 'aye', 72 voting 'nay'.

Is it a majority of those voting on the question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Motion to table, yes."

J. Houlihan: "Well, I'd like a poll of the absentees in that case, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's requested a poll of the absentees. The hour of 8:28, January the 15th having arrived, we'll poll the absentees. Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether I should arise on a point of personal privilege or if you would do me the courtesy of extending a moment or two. I've been asked by Members, is this your Bill? I thought Matijevec was on the opposite side from you. Representative Sandquist made a speech that we had a full debate of this. Well, I'd only suggest to Representative Sandquist that it was late; late at night. There was some confusion at the time. When I explained the Bill, Mr. Speaker, if you'll recall, someone was asking me questions and I said, 'If you like the Bill, vote for it. If you don't like it, vote against it.' It's not that important to me. I happen to think that Representative Matijevec and I are right. This is a nonvoting Member and someone that understands the industry and all of us who have been around here over sixty days know that there's public members on all kinds of boards and Commissions, and people that have some expertise in that particular area. But I certainly would hope that there isn't anybody that's casting a vote for or against it because of me or Representative Matijevec. I happen to support Representative Matijevec and would solicit those of you who are interested to take the same position and vote red. That's... but



do what you want."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, you request a verification, is that correct? Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I will defer to Representative Sandquist who I know feels very strongly about this having served on the Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is going to take some time and I'm looking at the votes there. And even if we do win on the motion to lay on the table, I would need 89 votes to reconsider. I still feel very strongly about this. I really don't feel there's anything wrong with it, but I see that other people do. We'll come to that day when people will know that there's nothing wrong with it, it'll do no harm to people. So I'll withdraw my motion to reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec has withdrawn his motion to reconsider. 997, Representative Terzich on the floor? He withdrew it. Nonconcurrency. 693, Representative Soper. Representative Darrow, rather. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to renew my request to the floor... to the Chair that... to clear some of these people off of the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "All people not entitled to the floor, please retire to the gallery. All persons not entitled to the floor, retire to the gallery. Doorkeepers, please enforce that order. How about 830, Brady? Is that one gone? Representative Kane, on the Regular Calendar, 2347. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 2347 with the Amendment contains the authorization for the bond authorization for the Capital program next year. It doesn't correspond with the appropriation Bill that's in Conference Committee and I would move that the House refuse to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2347."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on Representative Kane's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2347 and request a Conference Committee."



Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

The motion carries. The House nonconcur. 689, ready on that one, Representative Brady? Brady, 689? Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm searching for the file for just one second. I'll be right with you. Messages from the Senate till we get our files ready."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee on House Bill 659. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee on House Bill 1428. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee on House Bill 1412. Adopted by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady on 689."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, 689 is the Formula Funding Bill for education for the public schools in the State of Illinois. The Senate Amendment that was added to it took line 14 from three hundred and four million ... a billion, three hundred and four million, five thousand to a billion, three twenty-eight, eight, eight, oh. Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, we, on this floor, debated this several times. We talked of different levels of funding that we could all try to agree upon. We came very close on three different occasions. I believe if we had a full membership, as I think we do tonight, we could have reached some agreement at that time. And working with the entire Membership at one point we came out with an Amendment, presented by Representative Stuffle, which would have put the level approximately two million higher than this Amendment does here. And another time as we got late in the Session we worked on another Amendment, would put it two million lower. The compromise they have reached, I believe, reflects two things. It reflects in my view a will of the majority...."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please. Proceed."

Brady: "It reflects in my view, I think, a will of the majority and it also reflects a hardly worked-out compromise where we can come up and fund the distributive formula at ninety-eight percent level. We talked about a full funding level. I, for one, still believe we could be there. We talked about whether we could afford this or not in Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen, I put before you that we're getting late in the hour of the Session where we can get together and reach a level of funding formula that'll insure a quality of education for all the students in Illinois. There are many Members here who have worked on this. We're all within a certain range. Many of us feel that there's an exact value price dollar that we know could be assessed to us. For one thing I think if we get a few Members to talk on this that we can demonstrate very graphically for you, is that we have saved money. Money that people have not even talked about yet. You've heard before the amount of money that's been spent this year and what the state can afford. I submit to you a few things. A Bill that Representative Schneider and myself and Representative Hoffman sponsored which



eliminated the interest payments given out to school districts around the State of Illinois on quarterly Special Ed payments. This savings alone amount to five million dollars in the State of Illinois. I think I can go through a litany of many of those savings but I would prefer that a few other Members might demonstrate for us what we could do. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Representative Brady is exactly correct when he says this is basically within two million dollars of the Amendment that we nearly passed without full attendance a few days ago. I think this is as much money as we possibly can come out with in the formula appropriation. Many of us would like to see full funding. We know from a demonstration of the vote here the other evening that the votes weren't there for full funding. We hope now that we can pass this particular piece of legislation in the amount that's there now. We think it's a reasonable amount, one that this Body can live with, one that's good for the school districts in this state. And I would encourage as Representative Brady did that we put the three more votes on that we didn't have the other evening and pass this piece of legislation onto to the Governor in the amount of House Bill 689."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman. Representative Ewing, please sit down."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The issue tonight is not what ought to be, the issue tonight is what can be...."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order. Representative Lucco, please sit down. Schneider. Proceed."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the issue tonight is not what ought to be but what can be. You have seen the accuracy of the projections of the Bureau of the Budget in terms of the ended year balance. We have an obligation and responsibility to all the citizens of the State of Illinois to be fiscally responsible. And so I say to you, it's not what ought to be but it's what can be. As I suggested to you when we had this previous debate that what we



should have done and did not do then we should do now, and that is, we should consider the categorical aids, we should look at them very closely and if possible shift money from the categoricals into the general distributive fund. I believe that there is somewhere between ten and twenty million dollars in the categoricals that can be shifted to the General Distributive Fund. There's only one way to do that and that is to nonconcur on the Senate Amendments to this Bill which add twenty-four million dollars to the program that we passed out of the House. And to nonconcur on the Categorical Aids Bill and to send them into a conference committee where reasonable, responsible people, in the light of the times in which we find ourselves, can set down and do what is in the best interest not only of the schools of this state but that which is in the best interest of the State of Illinois. Now those of you who have been in the Legislature, at least the last four years, know my dedication to the funding of the State Aid Formula which I have the privilege and the honor to Sponsor in 1973. I would be the last one if it were fiscally responsible and possible to oppose additional money into the Distributive Fund. Ladies and Gentlemen, I submit to you on the basis of sound and solid evidence that is not possible now. And we have an obligation not only to the schools but to all of the people of this state to do what is fiscally responsible and what is in the best interest of all the people including those who are involved in education. And it's for that reason and that reason alone that I stand in opposition to the Gentleman's motion and would encourage you to vote 'no' on that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, a group of us have worked tirelessly for education of all the children throughout the state. We have put this as the highest priority and we've worked at that... we've worked at it to the detriment of many other needs. We believe that this state has a special obligation for the children who through no fault of their own have been deprived culturally and economically. The federal government has recognized this particular problem. The State of Illinois has recognized this particular problem. And to that end we participated in a program to collect money from the federal government for the purpose of the educationally and disadvantaged



and deprived child. We collected this money from the federal government. We promised that we would give funds from the State of Illinois. And after we defrauded the federal government out of the money, we turned around and used it for purposes which it was not intended. I sat in on the Senate debate and I heard Senators defend their pilferage and misuse of these funds by such terms as 'we have always used the money for this purpose, we never intended to use it for any other purposes and to that degree we are entitled to it now'. There are those of us who cannot participate in this fraud upon our children as much as we would like to see the educational needs met. And to that end until there has been some adjustment, like all other groups that cry out and cry out with the feeble voice, there is no time of judgment like now. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, we will be obligated to vote 'present' on this particular issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the...Representative Brady answer a question or two?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Yourell: "House Amendment to House Bill 689 would have provided fifty-four million additional dollars to provide what is commonly known as full funding, is that correct?"

Brady: "Representative Yourell, we did not have an Amendment in that form. There was a difference between what the Republican on the Appropriation Committee took out of the Bill in full funding which amounted to fifty-four million dollars. I submitted the Bill at the full funding level."

Yourell: "That is my understanding. Now, how...how close are we to full funding if we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 689?"

Brady: "Very graphically we are halfway between. We are at ninety-eight percent, we would have been at a ninety-six percent level. We have moved that up halfway between. With the action taken in the Senate we moved up twenty-four million, three hundred and thirty thousand dollars."

Yourell: "So what you're saying, Representative Brady, is that we are not going to have full funding because the Amendments to House Bill 689 were not...did not receive a sufficient number of votes to do what



we want to do for full funding, so that anybody who votes for House Bill 689 in its final form will not in effect be voting for full funding of education in Illinois. And I just make that point to alert the Members of this House who are going back to their districts and say, 'yes, I voted for House Bill 689 to provide full funding for education in Illinois'. But we're really not doing that because we failed to adopt Amendment #2 in the amount of fifty-four million dollars to House Bill 689 which would have provided full funding. Now a Representative who was a Sponsor, Chief Sponsor of House Bill 1484 four years ago knows that that was the goal four years ago and we're not going to reach that goal nor do I expect to reach that goal next year. But just for the record, those of you who vote for House Bill 689, as I do, will really not be voting for full funding of education in Illinois without House Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose a motion to concur with Senate Amendments on House Bill 689. This chamber has spoken once this Session loud and clear about funding for our schools. I rise tonight to urge that we repeat that message to the people across the rotunda that didn't hear what we said. Last week the House acted very responsibly in approving school funding in a level close to what the Governor said our state could afford. Since that time the Senate has approved appropriations nearly forty-three million dollars over that figure in House Bill 689 and House Bill 2361. The Senate has promised much, much more than we can deliver. That promise is based on stories of magic money that the Governor says is not there. The Governor has a document that most Members of the House and the public has recognized as being the most accurate in the terms of revenue projections in our state's recent history. Today information on our General Fund's balance in this fiscal year has been made available and it shows that the Governor's revenue projections have been within four million dollars of being accurate and that has been agreed upon with Comptroller Bakalis. That's an amazing record when we consider that the Illinois Budget is about ten billion dollars or more. The budget estimate for that balance was forty-eight million. Today we know that the Governor's



projection is on target. We'll finish this fiscal year with fifty-two million dollars in the State Treasury and that statement has been agreed upon by Comptroller Bakalis. That certainly should convince all of us the stories of budget padding and magic money are nonsense. There's no hidden surplus in this budget. There's no extra money for education. There's no reason to appropriate more money than we can spend, than we have to spend. The Governor's budget is an education budget. Governor Thompson has increased state aid to our local schools by a whopping seventy-five million dollars. In one year he's raised the state support for local schools from eighty-nine percent of full funding to ninety-six percent of full funding as approved by the House. That is a full three percent more than the Illinois Office of Education told our schools to expect. Our local schools have enough problems. They don't need us to confuse them with a situation by promising more than we can deliver. The Governor let the local schools know January 31st what they could plan to receive. They've already approved budgets based on those projections, so let's not give them false hope at this late date. The issue tonight is not whether we want to support our local schools. I'm certain there's no Member here who wishes to give our local schools more support than I do, but I also believe that education should not be a political football. We must act responsibly in approving only as much in appropriations as we know the state can really give our schools. Accepting this Bill as amended by the Senate will be nothing more than making a promise that we cannot keep. And if the people of Illinois are to have respect for us as individuals and the Legislature as an institution we must deliver what we promised. Tonight, I urge you to be responsible. Let's not play games with our local schools. Now is not the time to write a bad check on the State Treasury for funds we all know will not be there. Vote 'no'."

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

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, I'm not up-to-date on all of this legislative legerdemain that's going on and I know that the other night this House was kind enough to put Representative Jones' Amendment onto a Bill and it went over to the Senate and we're still having some problems. It had been my hope that that money which was



clearly delineated as to what the percentage of it was designed to do isn't being done and we're having problems. There are a group of us who would like to call upon you to direct this budget, I think what we are double-talking here about is what you're saying if the funding that should have gone to schools in depressed areas, where that money has been used throughout the school system. That means if this budget passes in its present form some of those schools will not be entitled to that money that they've been using for the last several years. It would be my hope that you would not vote for this budget until we get that matter straight either in a Conference Committee where we can enforce the law and do what...use the money as it was intended. It's better late than never and I think that the group of us are determined to do the best that we can to have this House follow the law as it was written at least three years ago. I would hope that those of you who supported us the other night would do so again in this instance and vote 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to...on his..."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when the schools were making up their budgets they were told they would get ninety-three percent. Later on the Governor found out that he could give ninety-six percent and he's done that. The schools in my district were happy to find out that they were going to get more than they were originally promised. Now, it would be false hope to tell these people they're going to get more because just lately the Director of the Bureau of the Budget came back with his figures on his projection and it's amazing how accurate they were in terms of what he had projected. And at that time the balance in the Treasury was forty-eight million dollars, enough to run the state about two days. Now I don't know how much finer you can cut it and still keep this state solvent. I think the schools are disappointed that they didn't get full funding. I think we'd all like to have it. But I think that they are happy in the sense that they got thirty percent more of full funding than they had expected in the beginning. I think it'd be irresponsible to go along with this additional amount."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', all opposed.... Previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, to close."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I think...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Brady. Would you shut the TV cameras off, please? Permission has not been granted. Kindly cut the TV cameras off? It's been a long day. Thank you very much. Mr. Brady to conclude."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think it's unfortunate that we come down to the final hour where we start discussing in the funding formula how we should resolve everybody's legislative program. I think this Bill is a priority Bill of this Session or any Session when we say education is our priority. I'd like to remind you that the Governor of this state said just that when he ran for that office, he said it all over the state. He said it since. When education is your priority I think you should at least move to the level, the commitment a legislative action has put us to. And that's a full funding level. I'm not coming and asking for that right now. I'm asking you to do something less than that. I'm talking about coming down twenty-seven million dollars from that level. And yet we hear comments that say that we can't hold out false promises. Well, if there was a false promise it's the promise that was made that priority would be the first education....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Brady. They've asked for permission now to have the TV cameras on. Hearing no objections the cameras will be put on, permission is granted, the lights are on. Mr. Brady, please proceed. Permission is granted."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we talk about our priorities and we talk about education we have to talk about at what level we decide to fund it as a Legislature. We have to talk about whether we, in the Legislature, feel that is truly our priority. There were comments made that we're not being responsible when we say that there have been things passed out of either chamber that were over the Governor's budget. It's my understanding that he said he's going to veto all of that. So let's not say that that's overspent so we can't afford education money so what we can do is talk about what we've saved so far."



I submit to you the other day on this floor without hardly any discussion at all Representative Schneider, myself and Hoffman passed a Bill which turns back this year to the State of Illinois five million dollars that would have gone to the school districts because we decided it'd hurt the cash flow. We said quarterly reimbursement payments would not include interest to local school districts. Well, they're going to be penalized now. They're not only not going to be properly funded, we're penalizing them five million dollars if we can't turn around and put that in the funding formula. Just the other day on the floor of the Senate a bonding Bill was defeated which would have paid out ten million dollars that schools districts were expecting in Special Ed reimbursement claims. Ten million dollars that they're not going to get now. Taking those two totals alone you're up to fifteen. I can start to quote you Mental Health and Public Aid Budget amounts. One in Public Aid became five million below the Governor's level. Another in Mental Health that's on his desk to sign right now is four million below his level. That's another nine. In a minute and a half here I've counted twenty-four million dollars that either the schools expected to get and we didn't give them or that we've saved from the Governor's Budget. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Senate submitted a Bill to us, twenty-four million, three hundred and thirty thousand dollars above the level we sent it to them. We've saved that money in the last week and I submit to you the only responsible course is to give it to the schools on a priority and give it to them because they need it. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 684...689. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Schwartz. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I urge an 'aye' vote on concurrence for two reasons. First of all, there's no way that in a Conference Committee we're going to get more money. This is a reasonable compromise. It's not all I would like to see. It's not full funding but it is a halfway step. Secondly, I would point out that if we get past midnight we're going to need a 107 votes in order to pass this Bill. That means we're even going to have less than we started with when



this Bill left the House. So I urge more green lights on this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my 'present' vote.

Most of you know that during the term that I have been here I have been an advocate of full funding of the schools. The one thing that I cannot advocate, Mr. Speaker, however, is fraudulent funding. And that's exactly what's in this Bill. This House voted to accept an Amendment to Senate Bill 1281 that would correct the fraudulent funding that is contained in this Bill. The House is to be applauded for accepting that Amendment. Unfortunately the Senate rejected it. If I vote for this increased funding, I'm going back to my district to say I got increased funding for the schools and they're going to say to me, 'We haven't been getting the money that has been funded for us for the last three years'. That's a fraud, Mr. Speaker. I will not perpetuate a fraud on the kids in my district, those kids across the State of Illinois that are educationally disadvantaged and whose head count is used to leverage Title I State Funds and the money is not spent on them. That to me would be a fraud. I vote 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll not take the time of the House, the decision here has been made on this subject on the past three or four votes. The record of this House in passing the appropriations has been made. For the first time in my memory here, my short memory here, the budget for the Department of Children and Family Services Public Aid, Public Health and Mental Health did not have to go to a Conference Committee. There were no huge additions to any of these budgets. In fact, there were no huge additions to any of the budgets that were presented in this General Assembly. We have adopted a kind of posture that is responsible for the Department's responsible for what we want to accomplish and responsible when we all go back to our districts, Democrats and Republicans, to indicate to the people that we were fiscally solid and we have provided them the kind of dollars that this state can end up affording. I urge the



Members of this House to join with Representative Ewell and Caldwell in voting 'present' for their reasons and voting 'no' for whatever reasons but to insure that this....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. James Houlihan, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the issue that has been raised about where the funds should go is a legitimate issue. But let me point out that what Representative Peters has talked about, not only have we not appropriated over what the budget was requested at, but in the Department of Public Aid we've appropriated six million dollars lower than what the Governor asked. In the Department of Mental Health we've appropriated four million dollars less than what the Governor asked. You know what the total reduction that this House and Senate has sent to the Governor? The Senate and the House in a number of Budget Bills has reduced over nineteen million dollars from the Governor's request. Now, that's nineteen million dollars that can be spent for what the Governor himself has set as his top priority, education. Are you aware of the fact that we set a budget lower in the Department of Children and Family Services in the Human Relations Commission? We have set the Governor's Budget where we have reduced nineteen million dollars and I suggest we ought to spend these dollars in education. And where we've appropriated over what the Governor has asked, let the Governor veto those funds because they're unnecessary. If the Governor's true priority is education then he can accept where the reductions that we've made, place them on education and veto the funds in those other departments where they may have been added in addition to what his request was. I think we ought to join with those who want these appropriations spent in a fair equitable manner according to the formula and whether our District One dollar...Title One dollars ought to be..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief. I just want to say one thing. I'm...kind a...I don't know how many times we have to beat this thing over the head, we've done it time and time again. But the most important consideration



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

....listening to what they've said as far as the Governor is concerned, and I want to commend him for one basic demonstration of telling the common schools that they were going to get seventy-five million dollars more, and at that time before negotiations at the local level in our eleven hundred school districts, and this is the key issue. They knew that they were going to get roughly about ninety-three percent and now we have three percent over and above that and I don't know what more you can ask for. When you start talking about full funding, we're at the ninety-six percent level based on what the Governor has asked for and I would only be in hopes that within the next year, possibly two, whatever it is, we'll have a hundred percent funding. When you can't spend something that's not there I commend the Governor for doing this thing well in advance in negotiations at the...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Jones, E: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to read to the Members of this House a portion of the transcript from May 31, 1973 where we were dealing with the Resource Equalized Formula that's contained in this Bill, House Bill 689. Senator Berman then said, I was Democratic spokesman on this side of the aisle for education said, 'It addresses itself to a problem which many of us recognize in the past formula by providing for funds for the disadvantaged student and that is to give recognition to the additional cost of educating the disadvantaged families'. It is for this reason that you see my vote on 'present' because this House was deceived in 1973. A fraud was perpetuated on the children of the State of Illinois as well as the people of this state. If we ...if we concur in this Amendment we will further that fraud. We've still got time to work out that problem. We can do it in Conference Committee and I recommend a 'present' vote on the concurrence on...on House Bill 689."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingstone, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Ewing."

Ewing: "My...my button was pushed by Mr. Winchester. I think he wants to talk."

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



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 71 'ayes', 68 'nays', 20 recorded as 'present' and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 689. And I would imagine that the Gentleman's request for a Conference Committee to be formed. Is that correct?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to make the motion, Mr. Brady? Mr. Ewing. I recognized you to explain your vote, you yielded to Mr. Winchester, he wasn't there, your time is up. Back to Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, I would like to move then to nonconcur and ask for a Conference....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved that we do not concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 689. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed.... Do not concur and a Conference Committee will be formed. Mr. Ewing, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Ewing: "Somebody else poked my button to speak and now they poked my button 'yes' when it had been 'no' and I want my vote recorded 'no' on that last recorded Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, so recorded. House Bill 2361, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2361 is the grant in aid program and the Senate has amended the Bill quite extensively. I recommend and I move now to nonconcur with the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2361."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do not concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3... no, I'm sorry. 1, 2, 4 and 5 to House Bill 2361. In order to save the time of the House, you want to explain the Amendments and why you're moving not concur?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have a fifteen page explanation of what the Senate did and I'm sure that in the mood of the House right now is to nonconcur..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."



Hanahan: "And I believe that the Membership in its anticipation of trying to put a package together on education, this is part of the total package and it should be heard in a Conference Committee so we come to a total consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do not concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 5. Is there any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. The House does not concur to House Bill... Senate Bill... House Bill 2361, Senate Amendments 1, 2, 4 and 5 and a Conference Committee is hereby requested. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Deuster: "I was back there trying to help Mr. Ewing get his button straightened out when House Bill 689 was considered. I wonder if I might have leave to be recorded 'no' on that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to repeat that?"

Deuster: "I was in the rear trying to help Representative Ewing seek your attention, he had a problem with his button and I didn't get to mine. I would like to be recorded as 'no' on House Bill 689."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'no' on House Bill 689. Is there any objection? Hearing none, you're so recorded. House Bill 818, Representative Don Brummet."

Brummet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 818 is the sediment control Bill for the soil and water conservation districts in the State of Illinois. The Senate put two Amendments on this Bill. The first one allows from the withdrawal of districts or municipalities by changing the Bill from a city or village annexing in its lands to removal of all or part of its lands from a district. A Senate Amendment #2 changes the sediment and erosion control program from a mandatory program to the voluntary compliance program. I move that we do concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Is there any discussion? The question is, that the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 818? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'."



Have all voted who wished? Marco. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'ayes', 4 'nays', 9 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 818 and the Bill is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1384, Mrs. Chapman. The Lady in the chamber? Mrs. Chapman. Mike, you want to sit down for a second? McClain. Mrs. Chapman in her chair? Take it out of the record. House Bill 1423, Mr. O'Brien. Out of the record. House Bill 1608, Mr. Telcser. You want to hear that Bill? Out of the record. House Bill 2398, State Government. Is that Jimmy Houlihan? House Bill 2398."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2398 was the legislation which we passed out of here which was approved by the Committee on Government Reorganization. This legislation was... had two technical errors where we had Amendments which were placed on in the Senate Committees. There was a full agreement between the Department, the Office of the Governor, the Democratic and Republican staff and I would urge a Concurrence on both Amendments, Amendment #1 and 2 on 2398."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House do concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2398. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'ayes', 3 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2398 and the measure is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1429. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1429 would appropriate three million dollars for the support of major museums throughout the State of Illinois. The Senate Amendments provide that the Department of Registration and Education will be the state agency to administer the disbursement of funds rather than the Arts Council. And I move for the adoption... excuse me. I move that we concur in the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, has moved that we do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1429. Is



there any discussion? The question is, shall the House do concur? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'ayes', 23 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1429 and this Bill is hereby declared passed. I'm sorry, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, I didn't get to my switch in time. May I be added to this, 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 1429. Any objections? Hearing none, so recorded. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, on House Bill 1384. Is she in the chamber? No. Okay, Representative Telcser on House Bill 1608. No. How about a Nonconcurrency on Senate Bill 937? Representative Kane. Kane. Okay. House Bill 1102, Representative McAuliffe. The Gentleman in the chamber? Okay. House Bill 1102. The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt..."

McAuliffe: "Move to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1102 which provides for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Local Government and Law Enforcement Officers Training Board. Any questions? No questions, that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I did put my light on before you called for the vote. I was wondering what the Conference Report..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ten thousand, five hundred dollars."

Levin: "Is this up or down from the House?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's the same as it went out of the House. They reduced it by ten thousand, five hundred in the Senate. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe, is that correct?"

McAuliffe: "That's correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Any further discussion? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'ayes', 4 'nays', none recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in the First



Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1102 is hereby declared passed. Do adopt. House Bill 1182, Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with House Bill 1182, with the... Amendment #1 and Amendment #3. Or do you want them separately?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "First, well let me point out to the photographers in the balcony and in the sides here that a TV light has been turned off so there'll be no more photos at the present time. And the Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1182. And before we do that, you'd better explain the Conference Committee Report."

Huskey: "Well, actually the... of Senate Bill #1 there was some technical changes. It took out some language of the Bill that would... I just ran from downstairs when I heard this coming up and I'm kind of out of breath, so I'll just..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, why don't we take it out of the record temporarily?"

Huskey: "All right."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Clerk, Mr. O'Brien, take that one out of the record. Let's go to 1412. Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with the Conference Committee Report, the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1412. The effect of the Amendment to the Bill that was introduced on the Equine Infectious Anemia Act is to totally repeal the Act. The insistence of both the Department of Agriculture and the horsemen's groups around the state has led us...made us come to this conclusion that it would do no good to put in hamstringing the Department of Agriculture into an untenable position of having an Act to administer that they feel that they could not under the present conditions do. They have appealed to the House and Senate to adopt this Amendment, and I've come to the conclusion that this is the best move to come to the House and repeal the E.I.A. Act, Equine Infectious Anemia Act. And I move to uphold the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1412."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers. Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Byers: "Representative Hanahan, where will this leave the E.I.A. after we do this now?"

Hanahan: "Well, there's still the federal regulation on crossing of state lines, plus it will still allow the Illinois Racing Commission, or Illinois State Fair Board, any county fair or any privately-owned bond that wants to continue to request in order to be stabled in their facilities a positive Coggins test. What we're repealing, though, is the administrative rule-making powers that the Department had that allows them to freeze brand and quarantine and almost insists upon the test and slaughter procedure on equine infectious anemia."

Byers: "What if I'm a horse trader, and I buy a horse in one county and want to move him five counties down the road, that barn could require that they take the Coggins test before they let any animals out of that barn, I assume."



Hanahan: "Yes, under the law you have a right as a horse trader or other or just a private citizen, and certainly under the federal...you know, the Department of Agriculture's rule-making powers, that you could insist upon a positive reaction to the Coggin's test upon your sale, as a condition of the sale."

Byers: "All right. Now, if you and I traded horses, and I wanted to sell you a horse, and you wanted to take it without taking the Coggin's test under this new provision of...that we're passing here. It would not be required if we moved it on state highways then to take the Coggin's test?"

Hanahan: "No, it would not. It removes that provision of the rules that prohibited the movement on a state highway of any horse without a positive Coggin's test."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed to speak on the question."

Byers: "All right. I think that this agreement's been worked out. I think it's a fair agreement. It's what we've had some problems with down in our district and I think that this is a reasonable solution and one that...that we should back and concur in this Conference Committee Report."

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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was just going to move the previous question on this outstanding Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to...close."

Hanahan: "I just urge a favorable Roll Call on this much-needed legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with the Conference Committee Report, the First Report on House Bill 1412. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Well, I didn't get a chance to ask the Gentleman, and I know he would've yielded, but in behalf of Eugenia Chapman, she wanted



me to ask if he's going to get back that horse that he fell in love with. Does this allow you to do that by this Conference Committee Report, Tom?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I think you're asking the wrong horse. The...are there any other questions or discussions? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey. All right, on this question there's 100... Clerk, take the record...on this question there's 134 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'...Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye', please... Mr. McClain as 'aye' and Mr....Mr. McPike as 'aye'...it's 137 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in the First Report on the Conference Committee on House Bill 1282 and is, hereby, declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schlickman: "Going to the order of sports, the Cubs, the next champion, world champion, are leading 1 to nothing in the seventh on Ontiveros' home run."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Schlickman, and I hope to God you're right. House Bill 2089, Mr. Mann? Bob Mann? The Gentleman in the chamber? The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mautino: "A point of order, Sir. I think I just heard you say that Conference Committee on 1182 was accepted, and I think it was 1412 on the board for the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, I said 1412. I'm sorry. It is 1412. And I gave the results. It's hereby declared passed and accepted. House Bill 2089, Mr. Mann? The Gentleman in the chamber? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 419, Mr. Hoffman. Senate Bill 419."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur with Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 419. I think I've touched base with everyone who's concerned about it. House Bill 419 is a product of the work of a Subcommittee of the School Problems Commission on Truancy. What we did in the Conference Committee Report was adopt House Amendment and merely clean up the language and some of the wording so that the language fit better together. There's no substantive change as the



signatures to the Conference Committee Report will attest and I move that we concur with Conference Committee Report... Senate Bill 419."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Keats: "Representative Hoffman, I remember this Bill when we were debating it during Committee and what I was trying to figure out at the time was making it more difficult for schools to deal with problem children, giving them even more layers of things they have to worry about when they're dealing with a kid who's causing trouble. Has this been cleared up so that it's not longer as much of an impediment for a school administration to enforce discipline?"

Hoffman: "I think that in the discussion before Committee and the Amendments that were adopted there that we dealt with that problem that we did not change that in the Senate or in the Conference Committee. The language is the same."

Keats: "I'm not sure that's better."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 419. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'ayes', 8 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'. and the House does adopt First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 419 and it's hereby passed and adopted. Senate Bill 997, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich. Bob, 997."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 997 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, has moved that the House do not recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 997. Is there any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. And a Conference Committee is requested. House Bill 2089, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann.



2089."

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we do concur with Conference Committee Report #1. It does meet the objective of the Bill which was to give the buyer at a particular time, namely five months after the sale, a precise figure which he would have to send in in order to redeem his property. It is now an exact Bill, a good Bill and I urge we do affirm Conference Committee #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2089? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich. No? All right, the Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2089. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Bruce... Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'ayes', no 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2089 is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, are you ready on House Bill 1182?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment please. 1182."

Huskey: "Representative Mautino chaired this Conference Committee, so I'm going to yield to him."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur in the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1182. The report was printed and distributed this morning with the signatures of six Members of the Conference Committee. Since that time, a technical problem has been worked out and nine of the ten Members have signed the Conference Committee Report. However, in the interest of time and in view of the late hour, I suggest that the House accept this report rather than waiting for an identical second report to be printed. What the report states is this. We have taken out the term 'exclusive' from the responsibility of the Department and allows Cook County to continue with the current situation that they have with the Department of Public Health in the County of Cook and the City of



Chicago. We also have accepted the one hundred thousand dollars special for gross sales for businesses exempted under this Act and I would move that we accept this Conference Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Yourell: "Are we taking Cook County completely out of the Bill now?"

Mautino: "No, Sir. They are under the same agreement that they have with the Department of Public Health as it currently exists."

Yourell: "In other words, but we did increase the total amount of revenue in the areas to be inspected from fifty thousand dollars to a hundred thousand dollars?"

Mautino: "It was acceptable. Originally it was two hundred thousand and we dropped it down to a hundred thousand. It was then suggested to be fifty thousand and we agreed on one hundred thousand, all of the ten Members."

Yourell: "In other words, we are now excluding 33% of the restaurants in Illinois from the Public Health Act?"

Mautino: "No, Sir. I don't know if 33% is correct. I don't have those figures. I understand it's in the area of between five and twenty. Five percent would be affected by the fifty thousand dollars gross sales and it was in the area of twenty to thirty, but no one had the figures exactly on the hundred thousand."

Yourell: "And what you're saying then between twenty and thirty percent would be exempt from the Act because of the doubling of the gross revenues of the restaurant?"

Mautino: "I think that would be the very small establishments that... you're very familiar with the restaurant operation, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "That's right."

Mautino: "I'm sure you're aware that a hundred thousand dollars gross sales in that particular line of business is very minimal. That would constitute probably one to two total employees and basically a hundred thousand dollars can be... is a very small business."

Yourell: "Well, I have to disagree with you, Sir, because a hundred thousand dollars would be about three hundred dollars a day gross



revenues and that is not... and that is not a small restaurant. Those are the ones who really need, those are the ones who really need to be under the Act because they are the ones who are... that you're exempting and..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Yourell. Would you give the Gentleman some attention please? It's a very important Bill, deserves your attention. Please proceed, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "And I can assure you, Sir, that 30% of the restaurants in Illinois will now be exempt under the provisions on this Bill. And those 30% are the ones who really need, that really need the control that would be provided by hiring somebody who had been accredited under the Public Health Code of the State of Illinois. The large restaurants do not have to have that because they are accredited, but you're taking one out of three restaurants or three restaurants out of ten in the State of Illinois and saying to them that you don't have to comply with public health standards. And the greasy spoons and those who cause all the problems in the State of Illinois in dispensing of food to the ones it exempts. And I vote... I would suggest you vote against this Conference Committee Report."

Mautino: "In answer to Representative Yourell's questions, please be advised, Sir, that no one is exempt from the health standards in the State of Illinois. This particular piece of legislation directs it at a person who is employed by the restaurant or the establishment to complete for certification an examination in sanitation. If, in fact, the statement of one of the Members of the Director of Public... of the Department of Public Health was correct, his statement was that it is their feelings that every employee of a business establishment covered under that Act would have to be certified under their rules and regulations. If that, in fact, is the case, I think you'd be doing something to harm the business, the small businesses throughout the State of Illinois and I can't agree with that particular position."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do not want you to be misled that this is something that the Health



Department is enforcing now. This rule, this bureaucratic rule that we're trying to safeguard the real small businessman will not go into effect until July of 1978. Now, I remember when one of the protesters of this Bill had a little restaurant. He and his wife served and he was dressed in white, cooking hamburgers behind the counter and I wished I knew that he was only a greasy spoon and I've never eaten his hamburgers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Bradley, to... on the discussion. Mr. Bradley please."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1182. What the Department of Health decided they would do would be to ask every restaurant owner in the State of Illinois to comply and have somebody working in their restaurant that could determine and comply with the health standards set forth by the Department of Health. In effect, that's what they were doing. The big operator and the fellow who has opened... seven days a week and twenty-four hours a day can comply with that rule and the regulation by simply sending one of his employees down to take the examination after they've sent him to school and he receives the educational background he needs to pass the examination. And that's fine, but that isn't what the question is here. The question that I think is, are we supplying, the restaurants in the State of Illinois, are they supplying the people who go to the restaurants with the type of food that meets the standards set forth by the Health Department? I have never seen any restaurant that continues in operation for very long that happens to be supplying a salad or potatoes or cheese or fish or chicken that's not cooked or food that is bad. What this is, really, is another governmental agency making it more difficult for somebody to stay in business and I, for one, I think that this is a step in the right direction. That the small operator in a... and to be a hundred thousand dollars is not small anymore, but those people are certainly, certainly very knowledgeable about the business that they're in and supplying good, edible food and I think that this is a good piece of legislation on this compromise that Representative Huskey has



worked so hard for in the past few months and I urge that the Members on this side of the aisle, those people who have restaurant owners in the rural areas and there are many of us that do, can continue to operate and the Health Departments in the various counties are making periodic checks anyway and I think it's a good piece of legislation. It addresses itself to a problem that businessmen have in Illinois and I hope that the Members on this side can give us a favorable vote on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you. Representative 'Mautini', I'd like to ask him a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's Mautino."

Neff: "Mautino, yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, let's relax. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, on the question."

Neff: "I think I understand you right that you're exempting from this new regulation all restaurants that do not have a hundred thousand dollars or less gross income. Is that right?"

Mautino: "Yes, Sir, that's correct."

Neff: "I'd like to speak that I think this is a good piece of legislation and it will help many of our small restaurants in our rural areas by this Amendment and I'd hope we would concur on it."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We hear a lot of talk in the House about bureaucracy, but we're talking about bureaucracy at the expense of the health and welfare of the citizens of this state. Why should anybody be afraid of being inspected for sanitary purposes if they don't have any problems? We're talking about food service sanitation here. I think one point that everybody in this House ought to be clear about, only half the counties in the State of Illinois have their own Health Department and that means no inspections for those other half that don't have it. This is not a compromise, this is a sell-out. This exempts not ma and pa stores, but restaurants that make it... a lot of money and that need



sanitation services. and that service the public and that are concerned with the health and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois. It's about time in the last day of the Legislature that we put the welfare, the health and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois number one. We hear a lot of talk about bureaucracy and every time you want to forget about health and welfare, you talk about bureaucracy. Let's talk about reality. Let's talk about sanitation. This is a terrible Amendment that the Senate put on exempting these large restaurants. We ought to vote 'no' and not adopt the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Deavers."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. Previous question has been moved, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to conclude."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is designed to help the small businessman to preserve the American dream. And what small business . . . most people start into today? There's very few left anymore. Restaurants is one of them. I'd move for your favorable consideration. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1182. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote. Marco... no."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Now, I have no objection to what the Gentleman is trying to do with the exception of one thing. We're taking 30% of the restaurants in Illinois out under the auspices of the... of hiring a person who has been accredited by the public health system in Illinois. Now, for thirty-five years I have operated and owned restaurants in Illinois and the Gentleman referred to one of my places as a greasy spoon. Well, I can tell you, Sir, that I always had people accredited by the Department of Public Health and because of that fact, my business prospered and... to the point where now I don't have to work in those joints anymore. But any legislation that



takes one-third, one-third of the restaurants out of the jurisdiction of the Public Health Department cannot be any good and I would solicit an 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me point out to the Membership, there's some switches that are voted here and from the observation of the Chair, the Gentleman or the Lady is not here. Do me a favor, do yourself a favor so there's not a verification, if the person is recorded and not here, kindly put him as 'present'. And I don't want to mention any names, but please proceed to do so. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I am a Member of the Conference Committee who voted 'no' and who opposes this Conference Committee Report. I hope you will vote 'no' on this Conference Committee Report. This is not the Bill that left the House, only with ninety-five votes I might mention. This is not the Bill that left the House and went over to the Senate. It has come back from the Senate a very different Bill than the one which went over there. What the Bill did when it left the House was to exempt two thousand restaurants from having people who were... one person who was approved as having taken a sanitation program. When it came back to us from the Senate, it went up from 5% to 30% of the restaurants. Now, not only two thousand restaurants are exempted, but twelve thousand restaurants are exempted. I asked a question of the Department of Public Health today. I said, 'What incidents of food-borne diseases do people get from restaurants?' And if I can get my glasses on, I'd like to read you the answer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Get your glasses on."

Chapman: "He said that 70%...(microphone turned off)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I urge you to vote 'yes' for this Bill. I have called the restaurant people in my area together when this sanitation test was first suggested and forced on them. There are many of these restaurants that probably know more about sanitation..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, ma'am. Ladies and Gentlemen, could we



give the Lady your attention please? It's been a long day and a long evening, but we're debating a very important issue. Kindly give the Lady your attention. Please proceed, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These restaurant people probably know more about sanitation than you think and also you can sent all the people you want to take a test and they can come back and not do it. What we need and what we have is inspections that come into the restaurants and look. The test will mean nothing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's a lot of misunderstanding concerning this Conference Committee Report. First of all, I would point out it has nothing to do with inspections. The Department of Public Health..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, there's objections being raised. I believe you addressed yourself to this issue. You spoke in debate, so we'll recognize Mrs. Chapman on a point of order.

Mr. Chapman, what's your point of order?"

Chapman: "My point of order is that the Gentleman spoke in debaté, he is not a Sponsor of the Bill. I was on the Conference Committee, you didn't give me a chance to talk, you cut me off after one minute."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am, Ma'am, I have a timer up here. Everybody's equal, male or female, female or male, and you've got to abide by the time. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, to explain his vote. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you get some attention for this? It's a good Bill. We've got a lot of people milling around the floor and I know the things they're doing are important. Perhaps they could do it a little quieter so we could at least hear what people are saying."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leverenz, your point's well taken. Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, to explain her 'aye' vote with 111 'ayes'. Please proceed, ma'am."

Pullen: "Well, I would just like to mention..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your timer's on."



Pullen: "...that since the Sponsor's running mate was permitted to explain his vote as well as to debate the Bill, I would suggest perhaps Mr. Mautino could also be given that courtesy. And I'd like to yield my time to him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're not recognized for that purpose. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his 'no' vote."

Skinner: "Because Mrs. Kent is absolutely right that getting people certified won't bring clean restaurants, instead of voting 'yes', if you want to protect restaurants, you ought to be voting 'no'. If you want restaurants to be inspected, you should have voted for Senator Wooten's Bill. This does not call for the inspection of restaurants. This calls for them passing or employees to pass tests. Just because they pass a test doesn't mean you'll have a clean restaurant. Now, this is a chance to kill a bad Bill. If you vote 'no', they don't have to come back with a stronger Conference Committee. They can come back with a Conference Committee Report that nobody'll approve. We can kill the whole concept."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, on a point of personal privilege."

Yourell: "Yeah, I don't want to continue this debate. It's obvious that the votes are up there, but I would remind Mrs. Pullen who had said that I was the running mate of the Sponsor of this Bill, she's absolutely, one hundred percent wrong. I'm not his running mate. His running mate is Mrs. Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Barnes, I believe. Right? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'ayes', 50 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'. I'm sorry. Representative Van Duyne, what? And the House does concur... and the House does adopt First Report on House Bill 1182. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman. Don't get a stroke, I'm going to recognize you. What's your point?"

Chapman: "My point is that there's switches being voted and the Members are not at their seats."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, ma'am, it's a far call from 89 to 111 and I guarantee there's 89 people here."



Chapman: "Yes, but I do see a number of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want a verification?"

Chapman: "Well, I hate to ask for a verification at this hour on the 30th of June. I think that if the people who have voted green would just change their switches to 'present' or is it too late for that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am..."

Chapman: "Or I'd ask for you to dump the Roll Call..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I advised the House a long time ago that if the person who was not alongside of them was recorded and they were not there to kindly record their switch as 'present' and in turn, I believe there are seven recorded as 'present'. I believe the seven are here. I believe that fifty 'nos' are here and I believe 111 'ayes' are here. Now if you want to request a verification, you have the right to do so and I will recognize you for that fact."

Chapman: "I would respectfully ask you to dump the Roll Call and ask people to only vote their own switches. I really hate to ask for a verification, but I know there... I see people who are not at their seats. Maybe they're at someone else's seats, but they are not at their own seats."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dump the Roll Call. We'll start all over. Ma'am, I think you have to name somebody before we do that. Who?"

Chapman: "Representative Youngue, for one."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Chapman: "I do not see the Lady in her seat."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Youngue was just on the floor. All right, let's go. Dump the Roll, let's start all over again. The question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1182? All those in favor vote 'aye' and vote your own switch, all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will kindly take the record. On this question there's 95 'ayes', 43 'nays', 11 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in First Committee Report on House Bill 1182, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1062, Representative Waddell."



Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we should concur in the First Report of the Conference Committee. What it did was change the technical portion that was in error from 1.0 to one point and it also complies now with the safety standards and the standards of the Highway Act. Move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1062. Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. No, I have not. On this question there's 138 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present' and the House does accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1062, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1428, Representative Madigan. House Bill 2179, Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Conference Committee... what, in effect, we did was took out the provision of Senate Amendment #1 which required all counties to have merit systems and we left in the provision which provides that negotiated collective bargaining agreements will not be interfered with by this Bill. All the Members signed it and I would ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House does adopt First Conference Committee... The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Daniels: "We had a number of objections from some of our counties and the sheriffs therein. Do you know if those objections have been eliminated?"

Stanley: "Representative Daniels, I think the objections or the key objection was that all counties have to have merit systems. All this Bill does in the present form is spell out the procedures for dismissal which are now in the Administrative Review Act, that aren't making, you know, any significant changes, they just



spell them out. So I can't... I don't want to mislead you, but I can't tell you that all the sheriff's objections have been met. However, no sheriff has called me in regard to any specific objections."

Daniels: "You don't know if the Sheriff's Association has removed its objections to the Bill that originally they had..."

Stanley: "Originally the Sheriff's Association and Mr. Harbeck had asked for the Amendment regarding a mandating of all counties and he has requested since then that that Amendment be taken out. And at this point in time and my understanding is that there aren't any major objections to the Bill."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn." All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? At the present time, the sheriff's office downstate and the county jail wardens are not on the merit system. Is that true?"

Stanley: "There are many that are not, that's true."

Conti: "Yes, and under this Bill they'll all have to come under the merit system and under the personnel code."

Stanley: "No, that's not correct. No, that's not true, Representative Conti. There's sixteen downstate counties now that have Merit Commissions. All we are saying in this Bill is that those merit... those counties in which they have Merit Commissions, that the provisions in this Bill will be spelled out in regard to dismissal. We are not covering any new counties who are not already covered by this Bill other than spelling out the specific provisions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, to close. Stanley, to close. Mr. Stanley, to close."

Stanley: "Thank you, Speaker. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call and I think it's a good Bill and the Conference Committee concurred on it. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House do adopt First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2179? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this



question there's 111 'ayes', 27 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2179, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2306, Representative Meyer. 2306, Clerk."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, the First Conference Committee Report was a dismal failure and I would move at this time to move House Bill 2306 with leave of the House back to Veteran's Affairs and Rules and Regulations Committee from which it came and be placed on the Order of Interim Study."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, on that point of order."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you ask the Gentleman to explain why?"

Meyer: "The Senate refuses to recede from Senate Amendment #1 and the House Members refuse to concur in House Amendment... in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Could you kindly explain the Amendment?"

Meyer: "The Amendment had to do with... well, the Bill had to do with brokers, real estate brokers doing business under assumed names. The Senate Amendment had to do with limiting it only to one county. I talked to Chairman DiPrima of the Committee and he suggested that we place it back in the Committee for additional study."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do not adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2306 and further amends that request to ask that the Bill be put into the Interim Study Committee. Is there any objection? Hearing none, it'll be so recorded. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Ayes have it, House Bill 2306 is in Interim Study Committee. Senate Bill 153, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 153 is the one to pay the Carl Tolpo estate for the Dirksen statues. As it left the House, the appropriation was for a total of about seventy-seven thousand dollars. Through some very careful auditing that was done by the staff and so forth, we reduced this amount by approximately thirty-three thousand dollars. I ask for the acceptance of Conference Report #1."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Hi, Joe. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Well, it seems to me that we've been struggling with this problem for a number of years to get this account straightened around so that all the statues are done and the people get paid. Now, you say that you reduced the amount by thirty thousand dollars. What about next year or the following Session? Will we be back in to appropriate more funds to pay the entire Bill?"

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Tuerk, the only thing I can say is this. The original contract was for a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. We have appropriated all of that money and an additional twelve thousand, five hundred dollars that would go to the Tolpo estate. Now, I can't tell you at this stage of the game whether Mrs. Tolpo is going to accept that figure or not. She obviously wanted more, but I can assure you it is twelve thousand, five hundred more than the original contract. In good conscience, it's about all that we felt that we could offer."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen. Your answers have been... your question has been answered. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Mulcahey: "Representative Rigney, you say this was reduced to seventy-seven thousand to forty-seven thousand, right?"

Rigney: "It was approximately seventy-seven thousand when it left here and now it's about approximately forty-four thousand."

Mulcahey: "Why did we appropriate seventy-seven thousand in the first place then?"

Rigney: "This was a figure that was presented to our staff as what the Tolpos felt that they were entitled to for some cost overruns for some expenses that they had not anticipated. It was approved here at the House level at that amount. When it went to the Senate, the Senate did not concur in the extra amount and that's why we



then had to go to Conference Committee and finally resolved this about midway in between the two figures."

Mulcahey: "Okay, so you think this forty-seven thousand dollars can do the job, is that right?"

Rigney: "I beg your pardon, I did not hear your question."

Mulcahey: "Do you think this forty-seven thousand dollars will do the job?"

Rigney: "Mr. Mulcahey, all I can say is that I feel that this is the best offer that we can logically make to them at this time. I do know and I don't mind telling the House, I don't think that Mrs. Tolpo is happy with this figure. I'm not sure she's going to release the contract on that basis, but if we do not get agreement at this level, I suppose that she could speak her relief in the Court of Claims."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was initially really wrestled with both in the Committee..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. John. Could we have a little order in the House please? Could we have a little order in the House? Would the Doorkeepers kindly ask all unauthorized personnel to leave? Could we have a little order in the House please? Please proceed, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we really wrestled with this Bill both in Committee and also the Conference Committee. I think Roscoe Cunningham said it best when he said that the problems that we've had with this Bill really brings out the basic inequities and the reason why Senator Dirksen never should have died in the first place. And, but what happened with the Senate Amendment and the... finally the Conference Committee Report, the Department of General Services is now going to take over those obligations that are outstanding debts. And we have recommended that we pay the Tolpo estate the amount of twelve thousand, five hundred as a settlement and now the Department of General Services, it will be our obligation that we live up to the final agreement to the contract. I think Mrs. Tolpo had better be happy with this arrangement. I think it's the best that anybody could do



for her. I was very concerned because one of the matters that was involved in what she felt was a state obligation to the estate was the fact that a pretty good substantial amount was paid for an addition to their facility and I didn't think that that was the state's obligation to pay for that facility. So I think we've come up with a good agreement, we've got to finalize this matter by the Conference Committee Report. We do finalize it and I would recommend an 'aye' vote on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney, to close."

Rigney: "Well, I think Mr. Matijevich did an excellent job of summarizing what's involved here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt the First Committee Report Senate Bill 153. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'ayes', 6 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in First Committee Report on Senate Bill 153 and is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 880, Jack Davis."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 880, I would move to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on. I refused to recede from the Amendment because it was technically incorrect what the Senate placed on it. It merely shifts around money in the operating budget to make a net reduction of some eighty-seven thousand dollars in the General Revenue Fund and transfers to the Criminal Justice Fund. I would move to adopt on final action."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 880. Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House do adopt? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote. The timer is on. After this, fine. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. Record Gene Barnes as 'aye'. John... Representative Polk, you are recorded as 'aye'. He's recorded as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, it's certainly obvious that this has to be the craziest night of all because one of the former Members just came on the board... came aboard. Former Representative Jack Beaupre from Bourbonnais."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hello, Jack. Welcome back. Hey, Clerk, what was the count on that? On this question there were 148 'ayes', 1 'nay' and the House does concur in the First Committee... Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 880 and is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schlickman: "To give some pleasure to the Cardinal fans."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're not recognized for that purpose."

Schlickman: "Well, going to the order of sports, the Cubs for the second consecutive night have proved that they are human, that they are not divine, they don't walk on water, that in the bottom of the ninth, they won 2 to 1."

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

Schlickman: "Yeah, lets move to reconsider the score by which the Cubs lost."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that until the 29th and 30th of the month, but June flu has begun."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 1428, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1428. The Bill...the Bill as amended in the Conference Committee would provide for the... it would provide that the... Mr. Speaker, could you take this out of the 'record for awhile?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why, Mr. Collins wasn't going to object. Okay. How about House Bill 44, Mr. Skinner. Cal, House Bill 44, you want to go with it? I can't hear you, I'm sorry. House Bill 44, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, this is the Bill of which everyone who voted for House Bill 44 is a Cosponsor except the Speaker and that's because he didn't want to be able to claim when he ran for reelection that he had



cosponsored the only tax relief that passed the General Assembly and was signed by the Governor. House Bill 44 contains approximately ten million dollars for additional tax relief for senior citizens which is not a bad trade considering they're losing about twenty million. But at any rate, it will benefit those people with rents of over a hundred and thirty-nine dollars a month and tax bills with over five hundred dollars a month. It won't quite benefit them as much as it would have as it left the House, but at least it gives us a reason to come back for more tax relief for senior citizens next year because some seniors will still be paying over 10% of their income in property taxes or the rent equivalent. I ask for approval of... this is... Excuse me, Representative Telcser asked if this is okay with Mandeville and the Budget Bureau. And the answer is 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the First Report on House Bill 44. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Question of the Sponsor if he'll yield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

D. Houlihan: "Tell us please what Act it is that is being repealed here."

Skinner: "It is an Act which Representative Jones and I sponsored in a Special Session of the Legislature that ran concurrent with the Session at which we passed the... the Regional Transportation Authority Bill which allowed senior citizens to apply for back-year circuit breaker grants."

D. Houlihan: "All right, then what is the effect of the repeal of this Act?"

Skinner: "Well, the effect is that one... that senior citizens will not be able to apply for grants which they missed in 1972, 1973 and 1974."

D. Houlihan: "What is the rationale then for the repealing?"

Skinner: "So that they won't be able to apply for those three years."

D. Houlihan: "Well, why should we be denying benefits to these senior citizens of the state?"

Skinner: "So we may find money in order to give benefits to those senior"

citizens who do apply."

D. Houlihan: "And the reason... Would I be correct in assuming that the reason these people have not applied at least in the main is because of their ignorance of the... that the fact that this law is in existence?"

Skinner: "That is probably the correct answer."

D. Houlihan: "And what do you anticipate will be the amount of funds then? I take it they would go into General Revenue as a result of this repealer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Houlihan, do you want to address yourself to the issue?"

Skinner: "Excuse me, but there is an answer to that question and I'm searching for it right now. We estimate it would be approximately ten million dollars."

D. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed. I believe an Amendment similar to this was defeated by the House."

Skinner: "As a matter of fact, that's correct."

D. Houlihan: "I have no further questions."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, my Leadership doesn't believe me when I say that we worked this out with the Budget Bureau this morning and they have asked me to take it out of the record for five minutes so they can make a phone call to whomever they wish to make a phone call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's take it out of the record for five minutes. Fine. Senate Bill 964, The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we do adopt the First Conference Report, Conference Committee Report to House 964. It makes a technical change that was inadvertently left out of the Bill that allows the candidates' poll watchers not to be removed from the election polling place by the Judges."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Is this the Bill that consolidates the position of..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, it is."

Schlickman: "Which Bill is this?"

Laurino: "It's the poll watchers Bill. We changed the name of the poll watchers and the challengers to indicate just..."

Schlickman: "Okay, according to what the Speaker said, this is the Bill that consolidates those two positions?"

Laurino: "Pardon me?"

Schlickman: "Is this the Bill that consolidates those two positions into one?"

Laurino: "Exactly."

Schlickman: "Yeah, okay. What is the Conference Committee Report?"

Laurino: "I just explained it."

Schlickman: "Well, you mumbled it. I'm sorry."

Laurino: "Oh, I'm sorry. It takes... we had inadvertently left out the candidates' poll watchers and now we've put them in so that the Judges don't remove them from the polling place."

Schlickman: "So that the person who is appointed to watch during the day may serve beyond six p.m."

Laurino: "Right."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Laurino: "And not be removed."

Schlickman: "What?"

Laurino: "Not be removed."

Schlickman: "And not be removed, right. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi. Well, your light's on. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I only rise now to register a complaint. It seems that I was appointed to serve on this Conference Committee and before the Speaker had even announced that such a meeting was going to be held, a Member... or I should not say, it was not a Member of the Legislature, came to me and asked me to sign the report which I refused to do. Now, there probably seems to be a good Amendment, nothing wrong with it. Seems like a good Bill. I just want to raise an objection that I strongly



resent the... having someone who is not a Member of this Legislature shove a piece of paper under my face for me to sign when I never had the courtesy of being invited to attend the meeting."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Has nothing to do with this Bill though, right?"

Wolf: "That's right, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. It's a good Bill. The Gentleman moves that the House...didn't you speak on this subject, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah."

Schlickman: "I love you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I love you, too. The point's not well taken."

Schlickman: "I have tremendous respect for you, but I do not think it's within the position of the Chair to comment on the merit of a Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I just wanted to point out that the Gentleman did not object himself to Senate Bill 964."

Schlickman: "But you commented that this is a good Bill and a Speaker should not do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm glad you agree. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino, to close." Laurino, to close."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just ask for a favorable report. It's a noncontroversial item that just couldn't straighten out a little technical Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 964. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. James Houlihan, to explain his 'aye' vote. You concur with the Speaker, right? Mr. Jim Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this good legislation. I've had my questions answered. I would have appreciated having them answered for the full Membership because they were germane and important questions that even Representative Lechowicz would have wanted to be enlightened by Representative Laurino's answer, but I think this is a good... a good Bill, a good Amendment and I urge the adoption..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "I appreciate your support. Thank you very much. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', 3 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 964, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, on House Bill 1428. 1428, Clerk."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1428. The Conference Committee Report provides that the appropriation contained in House Bill 1429 which we have already passed of three million dollars to the major museums throughout the state will be administered by the Department of Registration and Education rather than the Arts Council. I move for the adoption of the Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Just put your light on please and then we'll recognize you. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, is this a House Bill or a Senate Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a House Bill 1428. House Bill 1428. It takes awhile for the thing to revolve. There it is. All right, the Gentleman has moved that the House do concur with the First Committee Report on House Bill 1428. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Collins: "I'm going to have your attention, Sir. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Conference Committee Report would redefine the duties of the Arts Council. I'm trying to find the Conference Committee Report right here, but it is so broad that this place and maybe we should, this place, this House of Representatives, could qualify as a public museum. But even more ridiculous, it increases the membership of the Arts Council from twenty-one to thirty-five. Now, just think, just think what this means. Larry, Curley and Moe can now be joined by Ishkabibal, Vera Vague, and Daffy Duck. But what we're doing, we're putting fourteen more



fat cats..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, to explain his vote. Your light's on, Jim. You want to explain it?"

J. Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe in the funding of this particular program, but I think it more properly ought to be located in the Arts Council and I'll change my 'no' vote to 'present' on that circumstances."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'ayes', 33 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1428, is hereby declared passed. Representative Skinner, you got your clearance on House Bill 44 from the Governor's office?"

Skinner: "More importantly, I have it from the Budget Bureau as I had since this morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed. House Bill 44."

Skinner: "House Bill 44 will bring up to a hundred and fifty dollars more in property tax relief to those tax... to those homeowners who have a tax bill of over five hundred dollars or an equivalent which would be a hundred and thirty-nine dollars for a month. We do this by telling senior citizens and the disabled that they have to apply on time. They may no longer apply after the twelve-month period of initial eligibility. This provides the money for this relief. This does not solve the problem of senior citizens being taxed out of their homes. We still have work to do and I'm hopeful that the Governor will look kindly upon cutting the senior citizens in on the... on any increased revenues just as he has looked kindly upon cutting the state employees in on any increased revenue in the coming fiscal years."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion?"

Skinner: "I would remind the Membership that everyone who voted for the original Bill, approximately a hundred and sixty-five are Cosponsors of this and on their campaign pamphlets for reelection they may report that they are Cosponsor of the only tax relief



Bill that'll end up getting signed by the Governor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, Mrs. Zale Glauberman at Mr. Walsh's desk. You're out of order. The Gentleman from Cook... the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Cal, did you say then that the senior citizens are ineligible to apply for '72, '3 and '4 years?"

Skinner: "That is, they will not be able to apply except for the first year beginning on January 1. They will have the whole rest of the year, you can go out and find every senior citizen in your district and make all the applications out you want to and bankrupt the state thereby."

Schneider: "All right, we'll try that one."

Skinner: "You may join me in doing so."

Schneider: "Not a bad idea."

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

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Skinner, would you indicate to me that they will have one full year after the tax year or what is the time schedule now?"

Skinner: "One is able to apply, both renters and homeowners, starting January 1 or whenever they get the form from the Department of Revenue. They're generally mailed out at about the same time the income tax forms are mailed out and then they'll have through that calendar year. A full twelve months to be able to apply for benefits for that year."

Satterthwaite: "For benefits for that current year? That's what I don't understand because they won't be getting their tax bills until after, much after January 1."

Skinner: "Well, we changed that... Representative Anderson sponsored a Bill that allowed them to use a prior year's tax Bill in the application last Session."

Satterthwaite: "So that you're saying for one full calendar year beginning January 1, they can make application according to the tax or rent they paid during the previous year?"

Skinner: "That is correct."



Satterthwaite: "But at the end of that calendar year, then they no longer have the right to file for the previous year?"

Skinner: "That is correct."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Move the previous question."

Skinner: "Thank you, Bruce."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. Previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Well, I would just ask for a slow switch on the Speaker's part so everyone may get their 'aye' vote on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House do concur in the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 44. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Is that slow enough for you, Cal? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 161 'ayes', 4 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 44. Now on House Bill 1209, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move that we nonconcur in the First Conference Report and ask for the appointment of a Second Conference Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House does not concur with the First Conference Committee Report and ask for a request for a Second Conference Committee on House Bill 1209. Is there any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. A Second Conference Committee will be created."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 526, Representative Schneider. Schneider. What? Oh, I'm sorry. The Calendar says Mr. Schneider and now we're going to address the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the Bill that went out of the House 115 to 30. The Members of the Conference Committee were Schneider, Mudd, Capparelli, Keats and



myself. The major changes from the original House Bill are that the exemptions now are uniform for everyone who is publicly employed. The House Bill said thirty thousand. This requires everyone over twenty-five thousand to file. The other change was a Senate Amendment which said that the statement of economic interest had to include the place of employment and the title so that... for example, for an auditor, they'd have to say the Department of General Services, so on, so they could be identified. And I think those are the major changes from the House Bill that went to the Senate. I recommend this adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentlemen from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "What is the net effect, what does the Bill do now with the Amendment?"

Friedrich: "The net effect of the Bill now from the original law would be to increase from twenty to twenty-five thousand those public employees who'll have to file a statement of economic interest. It would require them to state where they are employed so that they could be identified. They can't just say auditor, they have to say auditor and a certain place, but also have the effect of excluding those whose income is under a hundred thousand dollars."

Hart: "How many additional state employees would this include?"

Friedrich: "Well, it wouldn't necessarily be state employees. I can't answer that."

Hart: "Well, all right. How many people would it include?"

Friedrich: "I have no idea, Sir. It was just the House Bill went out of here with thirty thousand, this reduced it back to twenty-five. The present law is twenty and I can't answer that, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Okay, well..."

Friedrich: "It was just an attempt, I think, on the part of Representative Schneider in the beginning to take care of inflation because there are a number of staff people, for example, around here who make more than that."

Hart: "Well, very briefly. I, you know, I didn't think it was a good Bill when it went over to the Senate. I think I voted against



the Bill to exclude these people in the first place. I believe that people who are employed by taxpayers' money ought to... oughtn't to be exempt from filing these statements. And I would oppose any attempt to change the law in that regard."

Friedrich: "It was my suggestion we leave it at twenty thousand which is the figure that we have, but the Conference Committee was an attempt to come to an agreement and this was the Conference Committee Report."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield?"

Friedrich: "Yes, I will."

Conti: "Does this have a strike provision in it or is this just collective bargaining?"

Friedrich: "No, if you're under a union contract and you make over twenty-five, you have to report; if you're not, you don't. The same as... it's uniform as far as any type of employee is concerned. Has nothing to do with organized under a contract or not."

Conti: "All right, thank you."

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

Robinson: "Is the effect of this Bill to take everyone out from reporting who are on boards, nonpaid boards, but very sensitive boards, for instance, the Capital Development Board?"

Friedrich: "If they're nonsalaried, if their income is less than a thousand dollars a year from their employment."

Robinson: "So they... on these boards, like the Capital Development Board which is nonsalaried and other sensitive boards then, would no longer have to report?"

Friedrich: "If their income is less than a thousand dollars from their service."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. The Gentleman, to close, Mr. Friedrich."



Friedrich: "I think this is not too different from the House Bill that went out. I think the changes that have been made are good and I move that we accept the First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is; shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 526. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Concurrence on the First Conference Committee Report. Have all voted who wished? Marco 'aye'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, to explain his vote."

Giorgi: "As I understand this Bill, the school board in Rockford that doesn't get paid but spends sixty-five million dollars doesn't have to file a statement of conflict of interest or an economic disclosure. That means the fourteen hundred school boards in the State of Illinois that don't get paid, that spend almost two and a half billion dollars don't have to file an economic disclosure? What are we talking? Are we crazy, are we losing our minds? They spent sixty-five million dollars in my community. You're not asking them to file an economic statement? Well, who's buying this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen, I know it's rather late in the evening, but in turn, I believe you should give the courtesy to every Member of this General Assembly to speak in debate and also to explain their votes. And the Gentleman has the floor, please proceed to explain your vote and reset the timer. Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman, I believe you're on."

Hoffman: "No, I'm... now, I am. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When this Bill left the House, we had moved the level of filing from twenty to thirty thousand dollars. This Conference Committee Report moves that figure back to twenty-five thousand dollars. Many people who are employees of school boards, many classroom teachers, particularly through the suburban area who have any length of tenure at all over the course



of the years, period of time are earning twenty thousand dollars. It's a waste of the taxpayers money for the County Clerk to have to have to handle these filings. Twenty-five thousand dollars will exclude some of them, but still all your school administrators from school principals up in most cases will still have to file. So I would encourage the support of this Conference Committee Report. It's a very reasonable report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this certainly does not exempt school board members or anyone else from committing a crime of accepting a bribe or a malfeasance in office or any of those things. And that is a felony. Certainly, they're not going to be deterred by this thing which is a misdemeanor if they intend to commit a felony and I would tell you this that the... this filing has discouraged a lot of responsible people from filing for school boards, library boards, park districts and so on. And I think that if you have had this problem in your town, it's difficult to get these people to run if they do have to file this. It's an additional expense for the auditors to audit to see that these are on file and I'm sure that in very few cases if there is anyone that ever looks at them. It does not relieve them from the crime of bribery or malfeasance in office which could be prosecuted under the Felony Act."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 86 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present' and the House does not adopt the First Committee Report on House Bill 526 and the Gentleman moves, Mr. Schneider, that a Second Conference Committee be appointed. Is that correct, Mr. Schneider? Oh, I'm sorry. That's on... Mr. Friedrich moves. Schneider's on the Calendar. Second Conference Committee will be appointed. House Bill 1064, Mr. Mahar. Turn him on. Mr. Mahar is on."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do concur with the First Conference Committee Report in House Bill 1064. House Bill 1064 is the



appropriation for the Downstate Teachers Pension Fund. As the Bill left the House, it was unamended. In the Senate, eighty-nine thousand dollars was taken out of the Bill. In Conference Committee, we added twenty-six thousand dollars back. There was five thousand dollars taken out of travel which was left out, five thousand out of printing which was left out and twenty-six thousand dollars was added back into personnel services to hire two people and I'd urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1064. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco, Marco. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'ayes', 4 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House adopts the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1964 and is hereby declared passed. House Bill 611. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 611 could be called... sponsored by Darrow, Getty, Daniels, Nimrod and Collins. What this is is the procedure for handling a person who's been found not guilty by reason of insanity. What has occurred since the Bill was originally passed out of this House is that we had a Bill pass out of both the House and Senate sponsored by Senator Nimrod and Collins and Representative Daniels. That went to the Governor. Today the Governor amendatorily vetoed it to put in provisions for prerelease examination by a psychiatrist not employed by the Department of Mental Health and provisions for a court hearing before any modification in the courts original order. What the First Conference Committee Report does is it takes Representative Daniels Bill, incorporates the Governor's amendatory changes and puts it together and that is what we will be voting on tonight. Hopefully, we'll be able to get this on the Governor's desk or the amendatory veto acted upon tonight. Either way, we'll have this problem solved once and for all by the first of July. I would solicit an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do concur First Committee Report on House Bill 611. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130, 140 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in the First Committee Report on House Bill 611. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald, on House Bill 1071."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I recommend that we do concur in the Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 1071. This is the appropriation for the Institute of Environmental Quality. The recommendation is to restore a new position for the needs of the environment.... I mean, for the economic impact statements which have increased the need for personnel. Now, this reduces the energy project by sixty-five thousand, five hundred dollars. It reduces air pollution projects by twenty-six thousand, eight hundred; reduces environmental education by twenty-five thousand; reduces the economic impact studies by twenty-five hundred, so I recommend that we do accept the First Conference Report on House Bill 1071."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Lady moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1071. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'aye', 2 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present' and the House concurs in the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1071, hereby declared passed. On Nonconcurrency, Senate Bill 1281. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we do not recede from House Amendment #5 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do not recede from House Amendment #5 on Senate Bill 1281. Is there any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. The House does not recede from House Amendment #5 to 1281 and a Second Conference Committee will be appointed. Pardon



me? First Conference, I'm sorry. House Bill 822, Mr. Kelly. 822, Dick. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, 822."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 822. As I mentioned to you before, this would permit the alcoholic beverages to be delivered into municipal complexes or park districts. We did in the Conference Committee delete the provision which would allow alcoholic beverages into ballrooms of state universities. I certainly hope that this will solve the problem for some of those who raise the objection at the drinking in the state universities would be objectionable and I would ask for your...with your approval, to adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kelly is one of my most respected Members in this House, but again I want to remind you that right here in this hall where we're at tonight."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Conti: "This belongs to the people of the State of Illinois just like the village halls do, the fire barns; and you'll be getting requests for these bar mitvahs, these showers, the same things they said today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."

Conti: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's give the Gentleman a little order. Don't want to miss anybody's requests. Please proceed."

Conti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know what his intent is. He's trying to help some of these college towns. But by doing so, he's hurting every municipality. He's putting public pressure on every public official, every office holder, that they must relinquish the property-owned municipal halls for any kind of a social function that they want."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No."

Conti: "Yes. And I urge you to kill this Bill. I'm sorry. Mr. Kelly's been one of my best friends down here, but this is the first time I ever asked to... to look into this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield just for a few quick questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Does this then mandate that every municipality and local town is going to have a social director?"

Kelly: "No, definitely not. This is not... this is a permissive... this actually expands the municipal government and it gives them actually more authority. And it's very permissive and the Illinois Municipal League endorses this concept. So I know that..."

Leverenz: "The next question was with regard to the Illinois Municipal League, I understand they did come in and provide testimony with regard to this. I understand they have not taken a position on the Bill. Is that correct?"

Kelly: "They came into the House Committee and also into the Senate Committee and supported the Bill when it gave the municipalities the authority to permit the delivery of alcoholic beverages. The park district provision which is included in this Bill was not approved by the Illinois Municipal League and I know that they're not objecting to it, but I'm not saying they're endorsing the park district provision."

Leverenz: "Well, you finally got around to a 'no, they're not endorsing it. What about the insurance questions? What will be the impact and cost of the increased insurance necessary to implement this?"

Kelly: "Well, there's a dram shop requirement, so the municipalities aren't... or the park districts are not going to have any additional. The people that are going to use the facilities are the ones that are going to pay for the dram shop liability insurance."

Leverenz: "I thank you, Representative Kelly. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "Certainly, I think that the municipalities have been impaired by the increased insurance costs by whatever has been done to them. The municipalities certainly, I don't think, should be burdened with this problem. It can be taken care of at the local level. We have found out this evening that the Illinois Municipal League,



in fact, does not have a position on this Bill and I certainly ask that in the final analysis, we cannot work out the problems, that we defeat the Bill."

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

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

I rise again very quickly to speak on the Bill. I serve on the Conference Committee and I reluctantly wouldn't sign this Conference Committee Report either because actually all we took out is that one ballroom that somebody was trying to put in the Bill earlier. I think the principle of trying to legalize the volunteer firemen having beer at the firehouse is a good idea. I don't think this Bill addresses itself to that in doing so. It opens the thing up... wide up. There's going to be all kinds of problems with the Bill and I think that we ought to not concur with this report and redo the Bill in the next Session."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, what?"

Steczko: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he will."

Steczko: "Representative Kelly, with regard to the Illinois Municipal League's endorsement of this Bill, did they not endorse the Bill itself or did they say they could not endorse the provision as to park districts in the Bill?"

Kelly: "At the Committee hearing in the House and also in the Senate, they endorsed the proposal which did not include the park districts. Since then, I talked to them about it and they said they would reluctantly endorse it. I mean, that they would not... they would prefer to have it go through even with the park district provision in it."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, please proceed, Mr. Steczo."

Steczko: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as a Member of the Conference Committee on House Bill 18... 822 rather, it seems evident that this is a very desirable procedure on behalf of all municipalities and park districts. As I mentioned in the at the First Conference



Committee Report this morning, the various entities in our district like it. It won't be an open-ended procedure. They will be able to promulgate rules and regulations to require groups to have dram shop or to control the various dispensation of alcoholic beverages in those municipal or park district facilities. It's permissive. I don't see how there are any public pressures encumbered in this Bill and I urge support for Conference Committee Report #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to close. We'll get to you. Mr. Kelly, to close."

Kelly: "Well, I would just like to ask for your support of this Second Conference Committee Report. I feel that we did solve most of the problem when we deleted the provision on universities being able to deliver alcoholic beverages. This strictly pertains to the cities, villages and to park districts. And I don't think there is a Representative in the House here that hasn't been contacted by their park districts to have this type of legislation enacted into law. I think it's a good law. I'm proud to support it and I would ask you to do likewise."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 822? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Second Conference Committee Report."

Huff: "I was not allowed to participate in the questions I wanted to put to the Sponsor, but one of the things that confuses me that whenever we're talking about what is basically the devil's due, I'm sorry, the devil's brew, the elixir of debauchery and now you want to put it into the universities. I often wonder why we don't even consider letting them pass out pot also free because I have witnessed in many instances whenever this liquor is in evidence or free access to the people, it turns them into pompous Pomeranian jackasses, and I'm against this Conference."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to explain his



vote. The timer's on."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you know, we're told that the Illinois Municipal League sponsors and endorses this concept and this Bill. Well, I think that that's not necessarily so and I speak to the Vice President of the Illinois Municipal League. Sometimes our workers down here are those who represent the Municipal League, do things that they really aren't authorized by the League to do. It's a shoot from the ship, so to speak. Let me tell you, I've known of now hue and cry for the sale or the dispensing of alcoholic beverages in municipal buildings. I think there are some times when it would be justified, but I think this Bill goes much too far. And I think it's going to put a lot of pressure on the municipal officials to allow the dispensing of alcoholic beverages in any and all of the municipal facilities. I think the red vote is the proper vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to explain his vote. The timer's on. Mr. Kelly please, ma'am, ma'am. Mr. Kelly please. Thank you."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, well, we've got 48 votes up there, 49 right now and this kind of surprises me because we got 67 votes just a couple of hours ago and I just can't understand because we've actually taken out universities. And I... it seems to me like it ought to be the other way around. There ought to be more votes instead of less votes unless you believe in universities having the alcoholic liquor and I can't believe that. We'll just let the Bill go."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 51 'ayes', 109 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present' and the House does not adopt Conference Committee Report #2 on House Bill 822 and the Bill is defeated. House Bill 840, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 840 had to deal with the Monuments and Statutes Act and the problem with the Bill was about the Lincoln Memorial and the house for the caretaker and the appointment. So we had to compromise



on the thing. The state got the house for the visitors and Senator Davidson's got the descendents of the Civil War as the caretaker and I would move for adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 840."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 840. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Marco 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'ayes', no 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 840. Senate Bill 335. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell. Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to adopt the First Conference Committee Report and this on the Department of Law Enforcement. The expense for the Division of Investigation and the amount was amended down from four hundred and thirty-seven thousand to two hundred and eighteen thousand, six hundred. I'd move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 33... Clerk, you want to correct that? 335. 335, please. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 335. Is Mr. Ryan on the floor? George Ryan? Well, we'll get to him. House Bill 2368, on the Order of the Conference Committee Reports, on page 3 of the Calendar. Order of Concurrence, 2368. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan. What do you need? Is the Gentleman from Kankakee on the floor, Mr. Ryan? On House Bill 2368... Oh, good. Danny, why don't you handle House Bill 2368? 2368. You got the file."

D. Houlihan: "We don't have the file, if you could take it out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ryan. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on House Bill 2368. The Gentleman moves that the House concur



to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 2368. Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House adopt Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2368. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. All right, now on the question, the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's only common courtesy to explain what the Amendments are."

Speaker Lechowicz: "They're in your report. Have all voted... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, you're not going to have the Sponsor explain those two Amendments?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, the Sponsor is on the floor and he's willing to explain the Amendments. Will the Sponsor kindly explain the Amendments on House Bill 2368? That's Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #1 adds two hundred and ten thousand dollars for some repairs in the Capital Building. And Senate Amendment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Two hundred thousand dollars for repair of the Capital Building. What's the other one?"

Ryan: "Two hundred and ninety thousand dollars taken out in CETA money."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Two hundred, ninety thousand dollars taken out of what? CETA?"

Ryan: "CETA money, yes. C-E-T-A."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question? Have all voted who wished? Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "All, I was going to ask a question, but in way of explanation I wonder if, is there anywhere we're going to put the CETA funds because I understand that the House was applying for those funds and somebody tells me the Senate is upset because they weren't applying and I don't think just because they weren't going to apply that that should withhold the House from those funds. But I'll let you explain your vote and give me an answer. But since you're listening, I guess it doesn't make much difference."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Ryan: "This is the appropriations for the General Assembly and Speaker Redmond is the Chief Sponsor and I'm a Cosponsor with him. And I'm not, I'm not certain about the CETA money, Representative Matijevec. It will be... I understand it will be in 1736 Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword please, ma'am. Mr. Tipsword please."

Tipsword: "If you'd like this way, I'm trying to tell you no, please."

It's an error, I don't have anything to say."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a point of explanation, the CETA money will be in 1736. It hasn't been agreed upon. We will have the Conference Committee Report drafted now within the next thirty minutes."

Ryan: "I believe that's what I just said."

Leverenz: "That is correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'ayes', 14 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2368. House Bill 1109. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins. 1109, Phil."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill #1109 would put the Bill back in the form, the first part of the Bill, back in the form in which it left the House where we would require the aggregate amount of one hundred and fifty dollars to be reported on our campaign disclosure reports as is the... as is the case on our report of expenditures and contributions. The Senate has agreed to recede from the Amendment they made lowering that figure. The second part of the Bill includes what was a Bill that passed this House by 156 to nothing vote, but for some reason or another was sidetracked in the Senate which would require the State Board of Elections or its successor to prepare and publish and make available to election authorities and the public at large books containing relevant statutory provisions relating to candidates



for nominations for election or election to public offices. This was a Bill that was endorsed by the State Board of Elections as I understand it. It was not a Bill I handled. I agreed to have it included in my Bill for purposes of this Conference Committee Report and I would solicit the support of this House. The Conference Committee Report was signed by all the Members of the House and Senate in the unanimous action."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

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

Collins: "Yes, of course."

Leverenz: "Is there some message in this... new wording - 'or its successor' and who might that be?"

Collins: "Well, I don't know who it might be, but as of forty-nine minutes from now, it will be 'or its successor'."

Leverenz: "Might it be the Secretary of State?"

Collins: "I would hope so."

Leverenz: "Thank you for responding to the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further?"

Collins: "I don't wish to close, Mr. Speaker. I'll ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House adopt First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1109. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1109. Third Supplemental Calendar appears House Bill 1105. Representative Holewinski. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1105. There was a technical error in the Bill. One sentence was omitted. With agreement of all parties, the report was signed unanimously. What the report recommends now is just a form of notification of reporting of suspensions and medical privileges. I know of no opposition and I would move that the



House do adopt."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman's moved that the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1105. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1105. Representative Lechowicz, have you discussed it?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now, I didn't call the Bill. What Bill is it that you wanted me to call?"

Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 752."

Speaker Redmond: "And where is it?"

Lechowicz: "The Bill was heard in the... passed by the House with the House Amendments..."

Speaker Redmond: "I mean, what Calendar is it on?"

Lechowicz: "It's either 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, I don't know. I just got back here, Mr. Speaker. How about page 6? I don't know. Anyway, the Senate... page 4, fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Page 4."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do not concur with the action of the Senate and a Conference Committee be adopted. What they did is they only accepted certain Amendments to the Bill and left out many of the House Amendments that were considered as a priority item by the House. And in turn, I just want, rest assured, the Membership of this House that in the Conference Committee we'll be working on behalf of every legitimate Amendment that was offered and adopted by the House to make sure that it's concurred with in the Conference Committee and, in turn, I ask that a Conference Committee be created now on Senate Bill 752. And I move that we not concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Have found it on the Calendar, have you? Mr. Clerk, you... Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I wonder if the Gentleman would repeat what he said about the Conference Committee Report on this Bill. I have a particular interest it."



Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Dick, what?"

Walsh: "I wonder if you would repeat what you said or play the tape back about the Conference Committee on this particular Bill?"

Lechowicz: "Dick, I hope you're on a Conference Committee so you're happy."

Walsh: "What, did you move to nonconcur?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jim Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker..."

Walsh: "What is the motion, to nonconcur?"

J. Houlihan: "Representative Walsh, you're not speaking to the motion. The board is wrong. This is not a Conference Committee Report, this is a failure to recede, I believe."

Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Walsh: "I see."

Speaker Redmond: "I haven't found it on the Calendar yet."

Walsh: "It's up there, Mr. Speaker."

Lechowicz: "It's coming. It's a motion to refuse to recede from the House Amendment to Senate Bill 752 and ask for a Conference Committee be created. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed. Conference Committee is created."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... the Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment to Senate Bill 752. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Which Calendar is this on please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Which Calendar is this on please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, will you identify the Calendar that it's on?"

Lechowicz: "The first Calendar."

Pullen: "The refusal to recede motion is on the first Calendar?"

Lechowicz: "First Calendar."

Pullen: "But it hasn't been distributed to us?"

Lechowicz: "I got it here."

Pullen: "I don't. I wonder if we could hold this until we do."

Lechowicz: "Come on over."

Pullen: "No, thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "I understand that the message hasn't returned from the Senate yet, Representative Lechowicz. That's why we can't find it on the Calendar. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "You'd better check in the Clerk's office. It's been back for over an hour and a half."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Youngie."

Youngie: "A question, Mr. Speaker. At the time that you entertained that motion, shouldn't it be only to those Amendments that the Senate did not concur in?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Youngie, what did you say?"

Youngie: "At the time that you entertained the motion, Representative Lechowicz's motion, shouldn't it be only to...in reference to the Amendments that the Senate did not concur in?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we haven't been able to find the message from the Senate, so we can't proceed with that. Representative Ryan."

(con't on next page)



Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we're about to run out of time, I think we ought to take this one out of the record for a few minutes and move on with House Bill 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. On the original Calendar on the Order of concurrence appears House Bill 1. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker.... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is House Bill 1, the Habitual Criminal Act, amended with a determinate substantive Bill."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I question the germaness of Senate Amendment 2, to House Bill 1. Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment #2, is clearly beyond the subject of the Bill that is introduced... as it passed this House and as it was introduced in the Senate and I believe the concurrence in this Amendment would render this Bill invalid under the Illinois Constitution. If the House were to concur in this Amendment I do not believe that either you, Mr. Speaker or the President of the Senate could properly certify that this Bill was passed in accord with the Constitutional requirements. Now, Mr. Speaker, the subject of this Bill was established by its title, that subject is and I quote, 'an Act to require mandatory life sentences to persons convicted three or more times for the commission of certain felonies.' Mr. Speaker, that is the subject of this Bill, this Bill is not merely an Amendment to the Criminal Code or the Code of Corrections or the Code of Criminal Procedure. This Bill has a limited subject matter which is restricted to the subject of its title now, Senate Amendment #2, goes far beyond that limited subject. Senate Amendment #2, legislates six areas which are not related to the subject of this Bill as established by its title and those six areas are as follows: one, it provides



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

new penalties for certain felonies, secondly it creates a new felony classification, thirdly it changes parole and release rights with respect to new felony classification, fourthly it amends and I quote, 'an Act in regards to attorney generals and state's attorneys.' Fifthly, it makes certain changes in the Code of Criminal Procedure and lastly it creates the Criminal Sentencing Commission. Mr. Speaker, I submit on this point of order that this, Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1, violates in two respects the Constitution: requirements both of three readings in each House and also the Constitutional requirements of single subject matter the Bill be for the Assembly. And accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I request that you rule on the germaneness of this Senate Amendment to House Bill 1 and that you rule it not germane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm somewhat amazed that we would even have a question as to the germaneness herethis evening on this. We're not talking about an Amendment, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about a Bill. We're not going to vote on this as an Amendment, we're going to vote on it as a Bill. This is final action, Mr. Speaker, there should be no question about this and I'm suprised that you would even entertain such a motion and I think it's another stalling technique to keep that Bill from being called so the Democrat side of the aisle and you.... Mr. Speaker, you can kill this Bill and be responsible to the State of Illinois in not passing some law and order reform this Session. And I think that's your intent, Mr. Speaker, and I'm amazed that you would even entertain such a motion and I would certainly hope that you would not rule in favor of Mr. Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, your question before us is the Senate Amendment and whether we should concur in that Amendment. This House has already passed House Bill 1, as introduced,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

as introduced by the Sponsor, the Gentleman from Cook who did such a good job in passing that Bill affecting three time losers and he should be commended for it. What the Senate did was put an Amendment on, but it is not germane and puts the whole Bill in the Constitutional question. And our only motion before us is whether or not to concur in that Senate Amendment. We have already shown how we feel about House Bill 1, we liked it as it was introduced and passed out of this House. But, the Senate Amendment is not germane, the issues are raised by Representative Dan Houlihan and it should be ruled out in my opinion that it is not germane and then it will return to House Bill 1, as we passed it out of this House... Constitutional law and order provision of our good friend Representative Roman Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on this precise point I'm in my third term and I have heard time and time again the Chair rule... time and time again the Chair has ruled that when the Senate adds an Amendment the timely time, the proper time for the question of germaneness be submitted, is in the other body in the Senate. And that the Speaker of this House has no authority and as a matter of tradition and practice has never... has never tried to inject the Speaker and presiding officer of this chamber into the discretionary decisions of the presiding officer and the Members of the other chamber of the Senate. And when an Amendment is offered in the Senate, if any Members of the Senate wished to bring to the attention of the presiding officer the question of germaneness, they may do so at that time. But, when the Senate adds an Amendment and a Bill comes back here it has been tradition, it has been customary, it's never been done, we do not question... it is untimely to question, we do not question the germaneness. It is inappropriate at that time and I would respectfully suggest that



the Chair should continue that practice, that tradition and that custom that has been honored by the Chair and by the Speaker on many many occasions and I have stood here as other Members have stood when an effort was made to raise the question of germaneness and the Chair has always properly, I believe and rightfully declined to rule because it was not timely and because it was determined in the other body and I would offer that to the Speaker and to request that we continue in that practice."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is no doubt about it the Speaker in his fairness in the past has ruled that he has felt that he doesn't have the authority to rule on the germaneness of the Senate Amendments that come over here. It points out the basic unfairness that we as a Legislative Body have to rule on matters that because we do not have joint rules that we now look at the fallacy, the fallacy of even voting on this issue because we do not have joint rules. In other words we are saying that we as a House Body can rule on the germaneness of an Amendment that we have in the House. But, now that certain Amendment comes over here to the House that we can't rule on it. The Speaker,.....in all fairness, in the past has said, 'no, I can't rule.' But I say, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that the time has come right now... that the Speaker and the power of his Chair has got to say. It has gone too far... that the lack of joint rules now is pointing at me. That I, in the Speaker's Chair... if I do not rule on the germaneness of this Senate Amendment, I am going to touch the lives of people. That I am, by a ruling, determining whether one can rehabilitate himself or not. And I say, Mr. Speaker that if you... if you now rule that this matter is not germane because you must.. because it is gross... it is so gross, it is such a violation of what we have in the House as our rules and because we don't have joint rules and you



sit on the floor of the House.... Podium, that we need joint rules and it is not your fault that we don't have it. Mr. Speaker, you can be a big man, you can be a great Speaker, you can now rule and say because we don't have joint rules, I, as a Speaker of this House, will say now... here now that we've gone too far that this is not germane. It is so violative of what we know is the germaneness. Will I feel, Mr. Speaker that you can do everybody a great service by ruling this Amendment... this Senate Amendment not germane to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. I will get to you, Mr. Porter, in due course."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...."

Speaker Redmond: "I would like to admonish the Members, the admonition that Representative Schlickman posed a little bit earlier, just because you disagree with the subject matter of the content of somebody speaking is not a point of order. We will call on everybody in due course. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have consistently contended that it is within the province of the House... through the Speaker, to determine whether or not a Senate Amendment to a House Bill is germane. Consider, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that when acting to concur with a Senate Amendment we are engaging in final action. Consider also, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we are a bicameral system and as the Senate has arrived to determine the germaneness so do we. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have reflected upon the Constitution and I related my reflection to you and there is a Constitutional requirement of a Bill being restricted to one subject and by rules of a parliamentary society there is the requirement that an Amendment be germane. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're not talking about material things when we talk about House Bill 1. We're talking about human beings,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

we're talking about living and we're talking about life. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I call to your attention the title to House Bill 1, the title is, 'An Act to require mandatory life sentences for persons convicted three or more times of the commission of certain felonies.' That, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House is the subject of House Bill 1, as it was passed by this Body. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House look.... look at Amendment #2, to House Bill 1. It doesn't deal just with an Act to require mandatory life sentences for persons convicted three or more time of the commission of certain felonies. It also..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Schlickman, we'll turn the timer on."

Schlickman: "It deals with new felonies...."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that there was a request for a ruling from the Chair, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, people have asked to be recognized... including yourself."

Porter: "All right, Mr. Speaker, that's not debatable... let's get on with this, we already have a few...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, proceed."

Schlickman: "It is debatable, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 1, deals not only...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats... be quiet... or I will tell them I saw you at the wading pool over at the Mansion View."

Schlickman: "Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1, goes far beyond the limited scope... the limited subject of House Bill 1 as we passed it. It deals with new felony penalties, it deals with changing criminal procedure and it deals with creating a Criminal Sentencing Commission. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #2, is far beyond the scope or subject matter of House Bill 1, as it was introduced



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

and passed by this House and I think what is also important, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as was related by a previous speaker... We have Constitutional restraints on the legislative process and the Constitutional restraint of three readings in each Body is to insure that we're a deliberative process and that we act wisely. Amendment #2 to House Bill #1 was never, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, was never heard by a Committee either in the Senate or the House. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment is not germane, it is violatdve of the Constitutional requirement of a Bill being limited to one subject and to the requisite reading. And I urge you, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this Body... on the behalf of the deliberative process... on the behalf of the people of the State of Illinois that you rule that this Amendment is not germane, is out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, make your ruling. You know what you're going to rule already, so why don't you do it.."

Speaker Redmond: "I have.... I'm ready to make the ruling. As you know, I have previcously declined to rule on the germaneness of Senate Amendments to House Bills and the reason that I did that... according to Roberts Rules of Order, during the si.... that provides as follows: 'During the Session in which the Assembly has decided to question another main motion raising the same or substantially the same question cannot be introduced. And I have concluded that the Senate probably had passed on the question of germaneness to Amendments that were submitted to House Bills. Because of the interest that this Bill created... I researched whether or not the Senate... this question had been propounded to the President of the Senate and I found out that it had not. So, therefore, there had never been any discussion made with respect to whether this Bill was or was not germane. Now, looking at the original Bill, the title of the orginial Bill is an Act



to require mandatory life sentences for persons convicted of three or more times of the commission of certain felonies. The title of the Amendment is an Act to provide new felony penalties, to change parole and release rights relating thereto, and to require mandatory life sentences to those convicted of three specified offenses to change criminal procedure and to create a Criminal Sentencing Commission. And as Representative Houlihan pointed out, the Bill provided many things that were not contained within the title or the purview of the original Bill. It provided new penalties for certain felonies, creating a new felony classification, change parole and release rights with respect to new felony classification, amended an Act in regard to Attorney's General and State's Attorneys, made certain changes in the Code of Criminal Procedure and creates a Criminal Sentencing Commission, pretty obviously far beyond and far more extensive than the title and the contents of the original Bill. Now, the state... our rules provide, Rule 34, that no Amendment is in order unless it is confined to the subject of the Bill and it would seem to me to be rather apparent that this Amendment... this Senate Amendment to House Bill 1, is not confined to the subject of House Bill #1, as it was introduced and passed out of this House.... out of this chamber. It seems to me that this subject matter is really so serious that I went a little bit further than I normally do and I will have to confess that from here on in, I'm probably or will deviate from my previous practice of not passing on the question of germaneness but will investigate in each and every case and if, in fact, the President of the Senate or the presiding officer for the Senate had to make a decision, then I would be bound by that decision which considered at that point had been adjudicated. But if the President of the Senate or the presiding officer had not made a decision, then I would pass... intend to pass on the question of germaneness. Now, this is a very serious matter, the subject matter is



extremely serious and it would seem further to me that should we proceed considering this Amendment when my Parliamentarian has indicated to me that it is not germane, that there is good authority from the Body of this chamber that it is not germane, that I would be hard put to certify the Bill on passage... that it had met all of the requirements of the Constitution of the state, the statutes and the rules of this House. Therefore, I rule that the Senate Amendment #1 is not germane to House Bill #1. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I appeal the ruling of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Amendment #2, pardon me. The Gentleman appeals the ruling of the Chair. Five other Members support him in that request? The question is, shall the Chair be overruled? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, in view of your ruling... even if this Chair be overruled on this ruling, the Chair has stated if I understand the Chair correctly... that you would not certify this Bill to the Governor, if Senate Amendment #2 be adopted in the event that your ruling be overturned. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "It would be very difficult for me to certify that the procedure had been correct in the adoption of this Amendment... concurrence in this Amendment..."

Houlihan: "In that event, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the request to appeal the ruling of the Chair is a moot issue."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe he's entitled to put the question. The question is, shall the Chair be overruled? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. It requires 89 votes. Representative Hart."

Hart: "I just wanted to say in connection with your apparent statement that you wouldn't certify this Bill that my Congressman, Paul Simon, former Lieutenant Governor... made such a hasty statement one time and he was subsequently advised that it is a ministerial rather than a judgmental Act and I think the Speaker is in error in suggesting that that might be



some sort of procedure that could keep this Bill from going to the Governor. I could support the Speaker for other reasons but I can't support him if his reasons are based on that and I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "You recall the date of the Lieutenant Governor Simon's action?"

Hart: "I don't recall the date...."

Speaker Redmond: "The... of the new Constitution."

Hart: "I recall his hasty ill-advised remarks about it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 79 'ayes' and 83 'no'. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, would you poll the absentees please?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brady."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady, votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, Conti..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti, votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Giglio, Harris, Kornowicz, Kosinski,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I have established precedents. My precedent was to not overrule the Speaker that I helped elect, that is why I'm not voting on this issue. I had hoped the Speaker in the precedents that he had established could have complied with those precedents also."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the poll of the absentees. Present."

Clerk O'Brien: "Present. McAvoy, Murphy..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Murphy, votes 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Richmond, Schoeberlein, Stearney and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Stearney, 'aye'. On this question there is 81 'ayes' and 85 'nays' and the motion to overrule the Chair fails. Representative Kosinski, do you desire to move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1?"



Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, it appears that I have no choice in this matter. I had hoped that the precedent that is established by the Speaker of not ruling on the germaneness of a Senate Amendment would prevail. It is unusual that in this instance the Speaker took the time to research this situation. I have no recourse but to vote not to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House non-concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House non-concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the hour of twelve is getting close upon us and under our Rule 68 (e), I would move that we suspend 68 (e), it calls.... it said, 'After June 30th, of any year the House may not take up or vote upon Conference Committee Reports or Senate Amendments to House Bills or House Amendments to Senate Bills with respect to Bills which have at that date passed both Houses but which have not received final action by both Houses.' I would move to suspend that rule for a twenty-four hour period till the hour of 12:00 p.m., July 1st."

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

Daniels: "What affect does that motion have upon required votes to pass on a Conference Committee Report? We would still require how many votes to pass."

Speaker Redmond: "107."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? Representative Bradley has moved we suspend the appropriate rule, 68 (e), till twelve P.M., tomorrow night. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'aye' and 17 'no' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and



the rule is suspended, twelve p.m. tomorrow. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I have a question to ask regarding the statement you made on this motion. I believe you said twelve p.m. tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Twelve, midnight."

Kempiners: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "I never did know whether a.m. or p.m. or meridian or what it was, midnight. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "He said a twenty-four hour period, so I think it was clear when we voted."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Supplemental Calendar #7, the Order of Non-concurrence appears Senate Bill 752. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is on Supplemental Calendar #7, dated June 30th. I move that the House nonconcur to Senate Bill 752. Again, these are the omnibus appropriation Bills and in turn, the Senate adopted certain Amendments and did not adopt others. And in all fairness, we should move to not concur with Senate Bill 752 and ask for a Conference Committee to be created."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this again demonstrates the shortcomings on the Omnibus Commission Bill. This Bill has been hung with, as everyone knows, everything from a two and a half million dollars to formula for the cigarette tax to go to McCormick Place to a hundred thousand dollar appropriation to the Speaker to do a variety of things. I am in the position, Mr. Speaker, of agreeing with what the Senate did, but in the position of not wanting to vote so that McCormick Place can get two and a half million dollars in fiscal '78 and about four and a half million dollars every year thereafter to infinity. So, Mr. Speaker and I hope each and every one of you realize that on this measure, on this vote, you're damned if you do and damned if you don't. For my purpose, I really don't know how to vote. I think I'll vote 'present' and let them see if they can figure out what to do."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Schlickman."



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

Speaker Redmond: "State your point of order, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, our rules provide that on June 30th, an item may not be acted upon until it has been on the Calendar and distributed on our desks one hour. This was distributed at 11:30 and it's 11:4... excuse me, 11:51 or 52."

Speaker Redmond: "The rule does not apply to nonconcurrences to House Amendments. Anything further? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Walsh said he would let them figure out what to do. Well, they figured out what to do last year. They called us back in Special Session because these were not passed for these Commissions. And if you want to come back on Special Session, then don't let this go to Conference Committee. Now, I am critical of the Senate because a number of these were as individual Bills for them to discuss in the Appropriations Committee, the same as the House did. But because they were dilatory and didn't get around to doing their work, they wanted to put it off and have it in this manner. I think the Senate is entirely responsible for us being in this position, but I don't know what alternative we have at this point."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur... refuses to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 752. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Schlickman has requested that the... the division of the question. The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #2. Those... Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "May we have a description by the Sponsor of this Bill, the House Sponsor, as to each of the Amendments so that we know what we're voting upon?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I'll be more than happy to tell the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, exactly what each Amendment does."

Schlickman: "As we vote on them individually."

Lechowicz: "Partner, I'll be here till five o'clock with you and I'll explain every Amendment to you, exactly tell you where it's coming



from."

Schlickman: "Left field to right field."

Lechowicz: "Fine. Amendment #2... First of all, Amendment #1 was withdrawn in Committee. The Senate concurred with Amendment #2. Amendment #3 failed in Committee. Amendment #4, they concurred with. I'm sorry. Amendment #2, they did not concur with which reduced forty-four thousand, one hundred and ten dollars in General Revenue Funds from the operations of the Illinois Prosecutor's Advisory Council and thirty-one thousand, five hundred dollars from the County Appellate Division Revenue Fund for the Appellate Division of the Illinois Prosecutor's Advisory Council. This Amendment made a net reduction of seventy-five thousand, six hundred, ten dollars. The Senate refused to concur with the Amendment."

Schlickman: "Then your motion with respect to this Amendment is not to recede?"

Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "I urge an 'aye' vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... the House refuses to recede from Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 752. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from Amendment #2."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, the second Amendment that the Senate refused to concur in was Amendment #4 which reduced the Judicial Advisory Council by seven thousand dollars. From twenty-five thousand to eighteen thousand dollars and I move that the House do not concur... do not refuse to recede from House Amendment #4."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "To join with the Gentleman from Cook, in refusing to recede from this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman refuses to recede from Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed say 'no' and the 'ayes' have it. And we... House refuses to recede from Amendment #4 to 752."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also move that the House do not recede from Committee Amendment #18 which added a hundred



and five thousand, six hundred and fifty-eight dollars to the Illinois Prosecutors' Advisory Council."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #18 to 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Before we make that ruling, Mr. Schlickman, the Gentleman from Cook."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "On the... he indicates he will."

Schlickman: "This was an Amendment that increased by a hundred and fifteen thousand dollars the appropriation to... decreased."

Lechowicz: "Decreased by a hundred and five thousand, six hundred and fifty-eight dollars to the Illinois Prosecutors' Advisory Council."

Schlickman: "I join with you in a motion not to recede."

Lechowicz: "God love you."

Schlickman: "My wife is Polish."

Lechowicz: "(Polish phrase). Let's go."

Speaker Bradley: "The House refuses to recede from Amendment #18 to 752. Mr. Lechowicz, further..."

Lechowicz: "You want to take 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 36, 38 as a package?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Lechowicz: "All right, fine. I move that the House do not recede from those Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Objections have been heard."

Lechowicz: "C'men, Bernie."

Speaker Bradley: "You want to divide the question, Bernie?"

Epton: "Of course. I want this thing to be done properly. I want to be like my colleague."

Speaker Bradley: "There's been objection. Let's take 22. The Gentleman moves to... the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment... House Amendment 22 to 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman now moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #23 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede. House... the Gentleman now



moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment 24 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does refuse to recede. Amendment 25. The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment 25 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede. The Gentleman now moves on Senate Amendment... House Amendment 30 to refuse to recede to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does refuse to recede from Amendment 30. House Amendment 31, the Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment 31 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. We refuse to recede. All right, Senate Amendment or House Amendment 36 to Senate Bill 752. The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 38 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's motion prevails. 43. Mr. Lechowicz, 43."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that this has been discussed. It's an issue of quite a bit of controversy. I think we made our point and in turn and in all fairness, I move that the House do recede from Amendment #43 to House Bill... Senate Bill 752."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we... the House does recede from Amendment, House Amendment 43 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye'... I think we're going to have to vote on this one. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', 2 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and the House recedes from House Amendment 43 to Senate Bill 752. 45. Mr. Huff, if it does not change the outcome of the voting, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Lechowicz



on Amendment 45."

Lechowicz: "How about 45 and 46, Mr. Speaker? I move that the House do not recede from Amendments 45 and 46 to Senate Bill 752."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to... the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 45 and 46 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion prevails."

Lechowicz: "Now I ask for a Conference Committee to be formed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a Conference Committee be appointed and it shall be done. On the Supplemental Calendar, Supplemental #5 appears House Bill 130... Senate Bill 1301. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. On the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1301, I think all the differences have been worked out. The Governor's office is in accord with this, the Secretary of State's office is in accord. We unanimously adopted the Conference Committee Report and I would request that the House adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1301."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, what is the vote requirement on the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Houlihan. I think we'd make an announcement.

If you have a Conference Committee Report or a Concurrence without an effective date which...everything but appropriation Bills, and it does not have an effective date and it passes here this evening, it would not become effective until July 1 of '78. And so we'd better send them back to the Con...for a Conference, Second Conference to put an effective date on the Bill unless you're willing to settle for July of '78. The Gentleman from Cook or the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "I would move to nonconcur and put it back in Conference."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur to Senate... to... wish to not adopt..."

Brummer: "Not adopt the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "...Conference Committee Report. And all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and



House does not adopt... does not adopt Conference Committee Report #1: The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Bradley, a point of parliamentary inquiry. If a Bill is passed with 107 votes, doesn't it take effect October of this year? I'd like to make my inquiry of your Parliamentarian."

Speaker Bradley: "We're waiting for the Parliamentarian to get off the phone."

Geo-Karis: "And due to the fact that today is now July the 1st, 1977, I thought if the Bill were passed with 107 votes, it would take effect in October. The Parliamentarian just went to your right."

Speaker Bradley: "Where is the Parliamentarian."

Geo-Karis: "He just stepped out over there in that door, Sir."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On your statement of putting an effective date on these Conference Committee Reports, is it possible for the Sponsor of the Conference Committee Report to make a motion that the Conference Committee Report be amended on its face rather than having everything put back in the Conference Committee?"

Speaker Bradley: "That we'd have to do in both Houses. I think... The October law only applies to Bills that pass before July 1st so it does not apply to those Bills passed after July 1st and we're after July 1st now."

Terzich: "I have another question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bill 152..."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

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

Geo-Karis: "I would like to get a complete answer of my inquiry. Part of my inquiry is, where a Bill says this Amendatory Act takes effect upon it becoming a law..."

Speaker Bradley: "That's all right."

Geo-Karis: "What do you mean by that's all right? That's what we're all confused about over here."

Speaker Bradley: "It would take effect with 107 votes and upon the signature of the Governor."

Geo-Karis: "So that will take it out of the July 1, 1978 ruling, is that correct?"



Speaker Bradley: "That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "Otherwise since we're in July 1, 1977, anything that's passed that doesn't have an effective date becomes law, then it's not law until July 1, 1978 and then you have to have 107 votes."

Speaker Bradley: "Not effective until that time."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "And I would suggest to those Conference Committees that are going to meet now that they use an effective date of October 1 of '77. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a Conference Committee Report which has passed the Senate before twelve o'clock, has not been called in this House yet. Can the same Conference Committee act or do I have to ask for another Committee of Conference to be appointed?"

Speaker Bradley: "How about getting another Conference Committee Report written on that one? Be safest thing to do. We've got time to do it."

Collins: "Do I have to have another Committee appointed?"

Speaker Bradley: "Just go get it written again and if they will reconsider their Report, yeah. Your question answered, Mr. Collins?"

Collins: "I'm somewhat confused by the answer I received."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we think it would be best if... and there would be no question about the action of the House in the Senate if you would move... well, you can either move not to adopt and ask for a Second Conference or go back and get the Senate to reconsider their action and then adopt a new Conference Committee with an effective date on it. So it looks like the best way to go would be a new Conference."

Collins: "I think the other would be easier, but..."

Speaker Bradley: "I think that would be the way to go. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 68(d) for twenty-four hours so that only hour on the Calendar will be required to act on Concurrences or Conference Committees rather than twenty-four hours as... which is provided for in Rule 68(d). In view of that provision, I therefore, move to suspend the provision of Rule 68(d)."



Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to... Mr. Kane, on the motion."

Kane: "Yeah, I'd like to ask a question on that. It says an hour on the Calendar. Would that also include an hour with the Report on our desks?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think that it does. We'll check."

Kane: "Yeah, I think that if we're going to suspend that rule, we ought to at least say that the Report is an hour on our desks also."

Speaker Bradley: "Printed and distributed and on the Calendar on 68 (d). All in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. We have some requests that we turn the lights down. The Gentleman from Kane... from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Parliamentary inquiry. Now that we've passed the midnight deadline and obviously we're going to be in Session July 1st, could the Chair indicate to us what the proposed schedule is, whether we're going to work straight through or whether we're going to adjourn and come back."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, right now, the Speaker is conferring with the President of the Senate. Let me tell you I think where we are and maybe you are probably wondering and trying to keep up. We are finished with the Supplemental Calendars 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 and all Bills on those Calendars have been acted upon. On the Regular Calendar of today, we have on Concurrences, House Bill 64, 36... well, we've got five Bills to take care of there and there are three on Nonconcurrences. Some of them we've passed over and haven't been called. We're working on House Calendar Supplemental #5 with about a half a dozen Bills there. And we have #6 with about six Bills there. And so if we continue for about another hour, it would be the opinion... in my opinion that without any great hassles which might come up at any time at this late date, we're going to be in fairly decent shape. So if we can move along as rapidly as possible, that doesn't mean we're going to get out of here because some of them are going to non-concur which is going to bring about a Conference Committee. And on speaking of Nonconcurrences, on Supplemental 5, Senate Bill 152. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman. Oh, let's take the record."



On the Gentleman's motion there are 129 'ayes', no 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Now, Senate Bill 152, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 152, I would move that the House nonconcur and that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment... House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 152. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the procedure here, if a Gentleman moves to nonconcur, then our parliamentary procedure at that point would be to resist the motion to nonconcur. Is that correct and ask for a Roll Call?"

Speaker Bradley: "If he so desires."

Daniels: "And I would ask for a Roll Call and ask for permission to address the subject of the nonconcurrence. Is a substitute motion in order to recede on that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "By the Sponsor."

Daniels: "And the Sponsor, would you agree to recede?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "No, absolutely not. Bill, let me explain this, if I may, to this Body. Senate Bill 152 is the reform and relief for unemployment compensation for employers of Illinois. Now, I can't imagine that the other side of the aisle is interested in killing reform and relief for employers under unemployment compensation in Illinois. After all the rhetoric and all the talk we've heard for the last six months about the crisis and unemployment compensation, all we want to do is bring this into a Conference, make some very minor changes to it and restore it to its condition where it passed out of this House with 115 affirmative votes. Now, if the Republican Party is going to kill it for employers of Illinois, I would be shocked and amazed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman yield? He indicates that he will."

Daniels: "Representative Greiman, you state that your intention is



to take it back for a few minor changes. Would you specify what your intentions are as to those few minor changes?"

Greiman: "Yeah, one, to put on a request that would limit holiday pay so that employees would not get double pay for holidays and they wouldn't get credited...a holiday against unemployment compensation. That's one. The other is, we affected the rights of women very significantly by changing the dependency rule which for many years had been fought and which in 1975, which changed to 25%. It's patently unfair and I don't think anybody really...cares to do that. It makes almost no impact on unemployment compensation."

Daniels: "All right, those are the two..."

Greiman: "Those are the two changes."

Daniels: "The only two changes that you're talking about."

Greiman: "Yes, Sir "

Daniels: "Now, Mr. Speaker, may I address the subject?"

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly might, Sir."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the reason that I rise to oppose the motion of nonconcurrence and suggest very strongly to you that you resist this motion and vote 'no' on the nonconcurrence, and then hopefully we'll follow up with a motion to recede, is some of the very reasons that the Sponsor himself has stated repeatedly regarding this Bill. You all have heard the problems on the Federal mandate on unemployment insurance and you may or may not be aware of the fact that the State of Illinois today is in debt to the Federal government, Employee and Trust Fund, to the tune of seven hundred and fifty-one million dollars. This is a problem that this General Assembly must face in the ensuing months and must present to the Federal government a mandate no later than November 10th of this year. Now, we are being asked to address the subject of unemployment insurance and we are asked under the Bill that is presently before you in Amendment #1 the liability for that Amendment that passed out of this House by a vote of 115 of approximately eight million dollars additional liability to the trust fund of this state. And we are told that it's insignificant to begin with.



We are told to go back to a Conference Committee that's after midnight on July 1st to discuss the subject, one in great depth, one that's very complicated. One that, yes, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is as complicated and as important to the importers of this state as the subject of workmen's compensation. I suggest to you that we not take it up at this time. I suggest to you the proper course of action is to recede from Amendment #1 and proceed on with the House business as we know it to be right now and I suggest strongly that you vote 'no' on the Nonconcurrency motion."

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

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make an inquiry of the previous speaker on this particular question, if he would not mind in answering that. If I understand you, Representative Daniels, are you saying that we do not want this Bill to go to a Conference Committee so that possible changes for the mandatory Federal program could not be implemented into this legislation? I kind of missed that part of it."

Daniels: "No, Sir. I have stated to you that I think that we should recede from Amendment #1 for the very simply reason of the difficult problems in unemployment insurance. We have tried and have talked to many people on both sides of the aisle and both the House and the Senate to implement the Federal mandate that's called for under the Federal legislation. What we are saying now is that the problems that we have in unemployment insurance are so deep and so troublesome that at this late hour, it's ridiculous to take it up. And furthermore, in answer to your question, we are told that one of the things that they want to do in Conference Committee, and I'm not suggesting that the Sponsor himself wants to do this, is to put the extended benefits provisions under this. And I think it's ridiculous at this hour to get into that subject."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Representative Daniels has pretty well covered this, but I think that there is something that should be brought to the



attention of the Members of the House. And that is one that I believe Mr. Greiman mentioned very specifically that the only two Amendments that they had proposed and you must remember that the Democratic side of the aisle will have the majority of one to make a change as far as the contributions... or not contributions, but for the dependency or the 50% versus 25% to dependency of a dependent child. And the other was to make the change whereby nobody could receive unemployment benefits on a day of a holiday. I think the thing that is facing us and is facing all of us unless there is some effort made. Now, these are the things that he said that were the only Amendments that they were attempting to make and that is the lack of compliance with the Federal compliance and some eighty thousand employers throughout the state have a... presently are below the present 2.7 unless we are in compliance with a Federal... laws prior to January of 1968. Their contributions are going to increase some one hundred and forty-one percent. Now, this is going to affect the small businessman, the individuals with a family operation, those that have no turnover as far as unemployment is concerned, those that have a habit of keeping their employees year round and are not losing them. This is not going to affect my business because I'm on the maximum right now, so I'm not talking about something that's going to affect me. We're talking about those that are going to affect the small businesses, the ma and pa operations, the things that are going to affect you and I and everyone else. And I think that the motion should be to recede. That's not the one that we have, but on... with the motion that we have, I think it should be soundly defeated and let's pass what we have and then come back some time and make some sense and come up with something that is going to benefit all of us and not going to penalize the small, individual businessman. I'm not talking about the big one. I'm talking about your and my neighbors, those that are going to get hit from 140 to 150% on an increase. Stop and think about what you're doing to them. If you want to put them out of business, let's go ahead and go into a Conference Committee and pass with the Amendment that they said



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

they were going to put on. And if they say they're going to, they've got the votes to do it because we can't stop them."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greiman, what was your motion again, Sir?"

Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Motion to not to recede and..."

Speaker Bradley: "Refuse to recede?"

Greiman: "Refuse to recede and for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "And to ask for a Conference Committee?"

Greiman: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, on that motion."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill has characterized this Bill as the..."

Speaker Bradley: "We're not on the Bill, Mr. Tuerk, we're on the motion."

Tuerk: "Well, all right, on the motion for Nonconcurrency. I would suggest to you that if the Gentleman wants a Conference Committee, that if he and other Members of his party wanted to address a real important issue and that is to come into compliance with the Federal Act, that's one thing. But that's not the reason for his motion to go to Conference. He wants to make a couple other corrections. Now, his party has had the opportunity to do some good and reform in this area of unemployment compensation. They have defeated one Bill in the Senate and have failed to move on others over in the Senate. Meanwhile, there's been no attempt whatsoever from that side of the aisle, the Majority Party, to do anything to correct this real problem that's facing the entire State of Illinois. Because of that, I would say that the proper way is to vote 'no' on the Nonconcurrency and then support the receding of the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 152."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm... I just want to remind on the motion or however you want to put it that as of twenty minutes ago, tomorrow morning, every employee in the State of Illinois is on a 4% maximum rate with an additional 1.3 surcharge by the Federal government to get rid of the seven hundred million dollar deficit that the Department of Bureau Employment Security has borrowed. I think we... I want this to go in the record,



that we have blown it and if you're talking about exoduses, there will be an exodus of businesses and employment will accelerate in the rank and files and they got in here, let them get themselves out."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose the motion.

Unemployment compensation is one of the problems in Illinois coupled with workmen' compensation which has caused employers to flee from our state. Now, Senate Bill 152 as originally introduced was a Bill that said something about prohibiting employment security offices from being within so many feet of elementary schools. Obviously, a shell Bill. And now at this eleventh hour, Mr. Speaker, after the Legislature is about to adjourn, when we're... after we've... the time to consider a Bill has expired, after the Labor and Commerce Committees in both the Senate and the House have refused to give adequate consideration to this problem, now we have a motion of this kind whereby the people who caused the problem, now want to provide a bandaid approach to settling the problem in Conference Committee. I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this is the wrong way to do it. This will only lead to more trouble. This will not solve the problem. The way to get at this problem is to vote to recede from the Amendment and then to hold proper hearings and this House in a deliberative fashion deal with the problems in unemployment compensation insurance which every Member of this House knows exists. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the only reasonable vote is to defeat this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentlemans motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, do you wish to close or just move..."

Greiman: "Very briefly, Sir. I always think that perhaps I'm in the wrong business, that perhaps I'm just too naive to be in this



House. And perhaps many of you will agree with that even, you know. I think I don't understand a lot of things that happen here. I listened for six months, six months I listened to the Republicans about unemployment compensation, about the need for it, about how terrible it is that we're not responding. Okay, and I see a hundred and fifteen votes cast out this Bill with some reform. And now I see what you want to do. I'm a babe in the woods. I'm naive. I thought you were sincere. I thought you really gave a damn, but you just don't. You just don't."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves... the Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 152. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

J. Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand why the people on the other side of the aisle are so afraid of this Bill. As it's been pointed out, they had all semester as we speak around here to come up with some legislation. They didn't offer it, they didn't offer it in Amendment form last week, they aren't offering it tonight. Why are they afraid for us to go to Committee and do our job? If they want to take care of the Federal mandate to correct unemployment, they represent business, where are their Bills? They stand here and criticize. Where are their programs? Where are their programs? We want relief."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Wikoff, you've already spoken in debate. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I've heard about everything now. How somebody could stand up over there and talk about a Bill that was introduced March the 1st to help the poor employer and who has to be considering it four months later after midnight with... and they say this is our big effort to help the employer. What a phony, phony statement that is."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 87 'ayes', 73 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and a Conference Committee will be repor..."



concurring... On the House Bill... The Gentleman from Champaign, on a... What's your point, Sir?"

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A statement was made a little while ago which is in error. I'm sure it was unintentional, but the deadline was not last night. I'm only saying this. Now, you have made sure that the vote was taken, the deadline is January 1, 1978. Now, you had your point. My light was on. I said many times, I requested a point of personal privilege. You've had your point, but I hope it's in the record that I was not recognized. I'm sure the Gentleman from Cook made no intentional mistake, but the deadline is January, 1978, not July 1."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 1216, Mr. Bluthardt. For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, arise?"

Kelly: "Yes, Speaker, I suppose you haven't heard from Mr. Redmond or the President of the Senate on what our schedule is for tonight, but in the meantime, I think that red light ought to be turned out because after midnight, I don't think we need any more of these..."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point's well taken. Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1216. When this matter came over for Concurrence at the last moment, I was advised that the Amendment #1 of the Senate did not, was not coordinated. In Conference Committee, we found that it was a coordinated Amendment. And what it did was remove a provision referring unreimbursed payment for travel expenses. This is a provision of the Campaign Financing Law. I would move to adopt the First Committee... Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1216 which is final action. And Mr. Bluthardt, it has been called to the Chair's attention it does not have an effective date and if it receives 89 votes or 107 either one, it won't become effective until July of '78."

Bluthardt: "I will hope that I can get the Governor to put an effective date on it."



Speaker Bradley: "All right, all in favor of the Gentleman's motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1216 signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, just an inquiry of the Chair. What would be the effect of the Governor amending in an effective date?"

Speaker Bradley: "Come back on an amendatory veto when we're back here this fall."

Tipsword: "And would require 107 votes then?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, sir. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. There's 150 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1216. House Bill 1217. Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I'm not on yet. Oh, yeah. All right, 1217 does the same thing that 1216 does. The only difference being that 1216 refers to the expenditure provisions of the Campaign Finance Act and this refers to the contribution provision. I would move to adopt the First Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1217. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. We've got some lights flashing here and I don't know if they want to speak or not. Would you turn off Stearney, Mahar? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On this question there are... Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does adopt with three-fifths majority, Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1217. House Bill 1406. Mr. Hanahan. Take it out of the record. 1762, Mr. Greiman, the Gentleman from Cook. Out of the record. 2030, Mr. Kucharski. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, for what purpose do you rise?"

Porter: "I'd like to ask unanimous leave to be changed from 'present' to 'yes' on House Bill 1109 and to be voted 'yes' on House Bill 1428. It will not change the results."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's do this. If you're going to do that anymore, let's come down to the desk and fill out the form or whatever has



to be done. If you can't get on a Bill at this late stage...
House Bill 2030, Mr. Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Conference Committee #1 on House Bill 2030."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2030. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I realize the hour is late, but would he let us know what's in the report?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think that's reasonable. Mr. Kucharski, they'd like to know what's in the Conference Committee Report."

Kucharski: "House Committee, I mean Conference Committee #1 Report asks that Senate Amendment #1 be stricken from the House Bill. What Senate Amendment #1 did was to regress the Bill back to the present written statute so, therefore, creating really no need for this Bill. So, the only alternative I would have if I am to pursue this road, is to ask that Senate Amendment #1 be taken off this Bill and that's what Conference Committee #1 is... report does."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman... Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Yeah, would the Sponsor tell us what the Bill does now with the Conference Committee?"

Kucharski: "If we adopt the Conference Committee Report 1, it would allow the Commerce Commission to close certain railroad crossings where there are no objections to the crossing being closed without a public hearing only after such crossing, that the... before it would be closed, that a ten-day notice would be circulated in the general circulation of the newspaper in the area and the ten-day's notification given to the local highway authority and local unit of government."

Kane: "So there would be, if there was ten-day's notice in the newspaper of general circulation, they could close the railroad crossing without a hearing?"

Kucharski: "Only if there are no objections by any parties that are within the jurisdiction of the boundaries of the crossing."

Kane: "And how would that..."



Kucharski: "If there is an objection, then there must be a hearing."

Kane: "And how would someone file an objection?"

Kucharski: "The same way that they do now with the Commerce Commission."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 2030 on examination of the Conference Committee Report that no action is necessary by this House, it simply recommends that the Senate recede from Senate Amendment #1 and they may have already done that before midnight of June the 30th. So I would make the parliamentary inquiry as to whether we should take any action with respect to Conference Committee 1 as respects the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you suggesting we not take any action on..."

Houlihan: "Well, I'm not suggesting. What I'm saying I suppose is a parliamentary inquiry here as far as what the effect of our action would be."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kucharski, could you enlighten us on... the Chair as to what happened with the Senate..."

Kucharski: "I'm not sure what has happened in the Senate as far as this Conference Committee is concerned. I'd just take it out of the record until we find out."

Speaker Bradley: "Would you check on that and let us know so we'll know where we are? Senate Bill 596. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

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

I move that we do concur on Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 596 and I would point out that this Bill does have an effective date on it so it is in order that we proceed in respect to Conference Committee Report #1. Senate Bill 596 amends the Revenue Act; specifically, that Section of the Revenue Act which refers to admissibility into evidence of certificate of errors in a judicial proceeding to collect or to enjoin the collection of tax based upon property. I would point out to the Assembly that this Section of the Revenue Act is applicable only to counties of one million or more. What the Bill addresses itself to is the authentication into... of a business record for



its introduction into evidence. That is also the title of the Section of the Revenue Act which is being amended. House Amendment #1 provided for a change in the present state of the law which requires an endorsement of such a certificate in order for it to be authenticated not only the assessor who originates the certificate of error, but also by the Board of Appeals. House Amendment #1 changed that procedure to require the endorsement, the dual endorsement by the Board of Appeals only for certificates of error of fifty thousand dollars as a result of the change. Conference Committee Report #1 recommends that the House recede from Amendment #1. I concur in the Conference Committee Report particularly since all we are addressing here with this legislation is the manner of authenticating a business record of the Assessor of Cook County, a record which he originates in order to have it admissible into evidence in a judicial proceeding. It will be the Judge who is the final arbiter as to whether or not the certificate of error will be approved or rejected. All that the Bill addresses itself to is the manner of having this admitted into evidence as an exception to the hearsay rule of evidence. The Conference Committee Report is reasonable. It deserves our support and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Representative Houlihan, is it my understanding then that the House will be receding from its Amendment? And that this will be the original Senate version?"

Houlihan: "That is correct, Representative."

Mugalian: "May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker? I wish everyone in the chamber would listen to this. It affects only Cook County, but we are talking about state legislation. What this Bill would do would be to completely undo the reform legislation that was adopted four years ago. The legislation four years ago was enacted in order to stop abuses involving certificates of error. And the solution that was adopted by the General Assembly and the Governor was to require the Board of Appeals to join in a request



for a certificate of error. And what this Bill has done has completely annulled and repealed that reform Act of four years ago. This subject was also taken up by Charles Nickodemus of the Chicago Daily News. Now, what this Conference Committee would have us do is repeal a compromise that the House agreed to which the House Revenue Committee said, 'look, we'll go for certificates of error without concurrence by the Board of Appeals in those cases involving less than fifty thousand dollars! Now, that is a very reasonable compromise, but that was not sufficient for the Senate which seeks for some reason to completely eliminate the protection that has been afforded by the Board of Appeals. I urge you not to accept this Conference Report. In fact, I hope the entire Bill is defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, only on the Order of Senate Adjournments. Just for your information everybody, the Senate adjourned until ten in the morning and I thought everybody ought to know that."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Bill. Everyone in this General Assembly should know this is a field enterprises flag Bill. To quote the Sun Times editorial, 'Citizens should be outraged at the Illinois Senate's recent step to scuttle a six-year old reform spawned by the scandals in the Cook County Assessor's office.' Now, that's rotten. That's bad. This Bill ought to be killed and a Representative who is running for the Assessor's office here ought to be ashamed of himself."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I find it hard to believe that the Amendment #1 of the House has failed to be approved in the Senate. This was an excellent compromise which I think was worked out in the Revenue Committee. We allow here for all those under fifty thousand to be waived. This would leave only those assessments over fifty thousand to be approved. This would probably provide all of the safeguards necessary to alleviate any of the potential scandals of past years. And I think we should vote against this Conference Committee Report."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on two points. First of all, to support Representative Houlihan's Bill and secondly, on a point of personal privilege that some thief stole my shoes. If whoever did it, would return them to me."

Speaker Bradley: "I notice on which side of the aisle that happened."

Meyer: "Yeah, but there are Democrats who come over on this side, Mr. Speaker, and they're not trustworthy either."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn, indicates he knows where the shoes are."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The shoe boxes are on the other side of the aisle and I just don't know where the shoe boxes are or where the shoe is. I would like to ask that we not concur with Conference Committee Report #1 on 596. We labored hard and long, we thought, with some good results in the Revenue Committee to put on a House Amendment #1. It was voted by the Revenue Committee and it really is a good Bill the way it was. I would hope that we would not concur with Conference Committee Report #1 and perhaps let the Bill die or go back to another Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Houlihan, do you wish to close? Mr... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to inform the people from downstate just what really is involved here because I was head of the Civil Division of the State's Attorneys office for four years in Cook County. I had to deal with this matter. What we're talking about here now are certificates of error. A lot of these are little small things that had to do because the people's homestead exemptions did not get on and there's a tremendous backlog in the County Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County. All of these are approved by the court, they're all approved by the State's Attorneys office before they become effective. And all we're talking about here is that the Board of Appeals really doesn't look at these and it just ties them up to let them go to the Board of Appeals. And it's really not necessary. Now, I can agree that the Amendment which went on and said that under fifty



thousand dollars this would be good. But I'll tell you one thing, it's better to have the Bill without that on than to kill the Bill. And therefore, on a current... setup, I think we should approve it."

Speaker Bradley: "Now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And I would like to particularly thank Representative Sandquist who is familiar with what the provisions of the Bill are and what the practical situation is that the Bill addressed. And, unfortunately, neither Representative Skinner or Representative Mugalian obviously have any real understanding of what we're attempting to do here by this Bill. Now, let me emphasize that the Section of the Revenue Act that we are seeking to amend with this legislation is entitled - Admissibility into Evidence of Certificates of Error. All that this Bill refers to is the authentication of a business record solely of the assessor of Cook County. It is in no sense a business record of the Board of Appeals. It can originate only by the Assessor of Cook County. Now, the effect of failure to do this where you require a sign-off by two administrative bodies, if one does not sign off the Board of Appeals, you must go through the cumbersome procedure of having someone from the Assessor's office come in to the judicial proceeding with the entire record and file from the Assessor's office. It is not necessary. All we are talking about here is an exception to the heresay rule of evidence. All it allows is the introduction into evidence, whether it will be accepted or rejected is a decision first by the office of the State's Attorney of Cook County and then the final arbitrator will be the Judge in the proceeding who can accept or reject. So we have here two levels of check and balance as far as the action of the Assessor in originating a certificate of error. Now, there is nowhere else that I'm familiar with in the statutes of this state that requires the authentication of a business record by two administrative bodies. That's all that the Bill addresses itself to. And we should not be misled by the uninformed remarks of the two speakers who addressed the Bill. They are simply unfamiliar



with the provisions of the Revenue Act, the very limited area that this Bill addresses itself to. It's a very reasonable Report and I ask that we concur in it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in the... the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 576, 596. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, to explain his vote. Mr. Telcser, to explain his vote."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm voting 'no' on 596 because I think that one of the prior speakers erred in his explanation. It seems to me that the way this Conference Committee Report was written, it takes out everybody from the protection that we thought the Bill had originally. It's my understanding that fifty thousand dollars or less was taken... was taken out in terms of cleaning up the backlog. As I understand now, everything is taken out. Everything. So the compromise which I thought was going to hold up in this piece of legislation, which I believe I supported earlier is now out of the Bill, out of the Conference Committee Report. It is for this reason I'm going to vote 'no'. I think it's a mistake to vote for it. The protection for the taxpayer which we had written into the law, I'm afraid, will now be abolished by this Conference Committee Report and I urge every Member to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I move that we nonconcur in Conference Committee Report #1 and request the appointment of a Second Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we not adopt Conference Committee Report #1 and moves for a Second Conference Committee. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. A Second Conference Committee shall be appointed. Now, give you some kind of an idea what the schedule might be, we will go to Supplemental #6. There are five Conference Committee Reports to be adopted and I think that will end up the work for this evening. So on that order of business,



appears... I'm sorry. And if we might advise the Members that are going to call those Bills to check for the effective date to see if they want to call them or get them rewritten for tomorrow morning. Senate Bill 1039, Mr. Garmisa. Out of the record? House Bill 741 on Supplemental #6, Conference Committee Report, the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 741. There was a technical error which we did not concur with, Senate Amendment, was the reason for bringing it back. They also agreed to handle a couple of those Bills and change them so that they were acceptable to everyone. They were called on First Reading in the Senate. They were House Bills that passed out of the House 108 to 10 and also 150 to nothing and I would ask that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to 741."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 741. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "I wanted to ask just one question. Maybe the Sponsor can answer it. I just want to know if all the Members of the Conference Committee signed the Report."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The answer was 'yes', Mr. Mugalian. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Unfortunately, we don't seem to have that file readily available and I was wondering if Representative Mudd could explain to us exactly what is contained in the Conference Committee Report."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again, first of all, the House added Amendment #1 on the Senate floor, places House Bill 741 in the permissive posture by changing 'shall' to 'may'; corrective error and reasons that we did not concur. Also, we had... it granted the service credit for downstates policemen on leave of absence with police organizations and it requires that he pay both payments. Nothing in this Bill has any cost factor whatsoever."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Houlihan."



Houlihan: "It wasn't so much the cost factor. There was a question about a... the technical form on the Amendment. Our staff person is talking with the Parliamentarian there. Could you hold up on it for just a minute, Joe, till we see if we've resolved this here as far as the form of the Amendment? The Parliamentarian, if you'll examine the form of the Amendment please."

Speaker Bradley: "Take the record."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I withdraw any objection I have, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Lauer, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Have all voted who wished?

Press Mr. Lauer's button back there would you please? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record.

On this question there 114 'ayes', 6 'nays' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 741. 1508. Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With respect to Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1508, I would like to note that I was not among the signatures of that report. I would like to ask Representative Lauer if he would take the floor and I would like to close on this matter. I would like to close on the matter by yielding to Representative Lauer, at this point."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lauer in the chamber?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Lechowicz, in the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Conference Committee Report #1, to 1508... does a couple of things. One, it addresses itself to those school districts that are not in a junior college district that would allow them to continue to charge a charge back... apply a tax to allow a charge back so those school districts would not be unduly assessed from the education fund. And would also allow that there would be another year extension on a back door referendum and I... it is something that we've done every year for the last three or four years that I know of. The intent and we could debate this question over and over again, but if you will read the 1965 statutes when Mr. Walsh and those Members who so wanted to have a junior college district, adopted that legislation, it was a very much



permissive legislation at that time, And the junior colleges that were set up... was set up by referendum of the people in those districts. They incorporated the area that they wanted to incorporate into a junior college district and this is the way that I think is the intent of the Legislature in 1965, in passing that law intended that law to be. To give the people the opportunity in the state to decide whether or not they needed a junior college district, whether they wanted to tax themselves to a junior college district and I think it should continue to be that way. I have a distinct feeling when we debate this question time and time again that some of the areas that are represented here on the floor have a feeling that misery loves company. And I think some of them are miserable at the fact that they are taxing twenty-five cents for one hundred dollars valuation to support their junior colleges and they now want us, who are not in a junior college district because the people in our districts have voted themselves out or have not indicated that they wanted to be in one. I think it is.... we should adopt this Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 1508. We've done it consistently and let's let the people decide by referendum what they want to do regarding the subject instead of forcing them to do something that they really do not want to do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

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

of the House, this is one of those situations where I think the inevitable has come. Some of us have been predicting it for some time and I will admit that I have been enjoying the battle with Mr. Walsh. In fact, I will regret in the future not being able to fight this battle with Mr. Walsh, but I'm sure we will, Bill... think of something to fight about. But that Bill has gone to the Governor's desk, whether or not he in his wisdom, or lack of it, sees fit to sign it is up to the Governor. This is the first time that Bill has



ever passed in both Houses but at this point I think probably all of those school districts who are not in a junior college district have heard the message. They now know that the inevitable has come and I think also at this point..... that position of a Gentleman.... I was in court on a speeding ticket that I thought was unjust and quite frankly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was a very interesting experience since I've never been in traffic court before, but the Gentleman who was before me in the docket had had about five speeding tickets and his profession was as a truck driver. And his lawyer said, 'Your Honor, we seek not justice, we don't plead the law; rather we are seeking mercy.' And I think probably that acceptance of this Conference Committee Report is an act of mercy, which will allow for one year for those districts which have not gone into a junior college district to expect the charge back, to levy the charge back and to know that you must do it. The inevitable is, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think this is one of those times when justice should be tempered with mercy."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm pleased to be able to rise in support of this. I believe that this is probably the fairest, the most honest, the most forthright thing this General Assembly can do for the taxpayers of those districts in this state who have decided their own destiny. I don't believe we have the right to decide their destiny against their will. They have often spoken their will and I would support this motion to give them that one more chance to be the master of their own destiny, to determine their own taxes and to provide for their own junior college education and I would ask your support of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor. Mr.

Walsh, are you seeking recognition on this subject?"

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



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

is no laughing matter. First of all, you will note that the Sponsor of the Bill is unable to sign the Conference Committee Report, And I understand from a conversation with him earlier that he is not going to vote for the.... adopt the Conference Committee Report. There has been a couple of misstatements made and I would like to correct them. First of all, the Gentleman from... who is the acting Speaker, said that it was the intent of the framers of the Community College Act that it should be voluntary for community colleges to enter, that is absolutely, diametrically not true. The proof of that is... at the time that was done the charge back was for a specific period of time. It was for either four or five years so it was clearly the intent of the framers of this Act. And I say this from some experience because I was on the Committee that drew this Bill up. It was clearly their intent that by 1970, that every place would be within a junior college district just as every place is within an elementary and secondary school district. It was further said that this Bill has never passed before, that is also not true. The identical Bill passed both Houses with Senate Bill 1188 in 1971. It passed both Houses and was amendatorily vetoed by Governor Ogilvie to provide for a back door referendum. That was a serious mistake I thought, but it would be a far more serious mistake to do it now and that's exactly what this Conference Committee Report does. This Conference Committee Report undoes what this House did by a substantial majority a few months ago... when it passed House Bill 1524. I regret that it is taking so long at this hour of the night. This should not be before us now, Mr. Speaker, there are certain Members of the Senate who can dictate what Conference Committees they want to be on and a few of them were waiting for this particular Bill in order to do damage to House Bill 1524. It's a subversion of the legislative process, we should defeat this decisively... everyone ought to vote 'no' regardless



of what their feeling is on the issue because the procedure is clearly bad."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair... except for one, the 'ayes' have it and the previous question is adopt... Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Over there they want to speak, you had four people who were proponents to this, there is several people...."

Speaker Bradley: "I have people who want to move the previous question. The previous question has been moved and adopted. It was adopted at voice vote and the question is on the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 1508. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no' and Mr. Keats, to explain his vote. Mr. Bowman, do you wish to close, Mr. Bowman?"

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker... yes, I wish to close if I can be guaranteed of not being cut off at one minute, I will be happy to close at this point."

Speaker Bradley: "You're going to have to talk fast as long as you've got twenty votes for your Bill."

Bowman: "Okay, I see the votes aren't there... I was not able to offer this Conference Committee Report in my own name because I felt honor bound at least on the commitments that I made when 1508 was considered by this House earlier. However, I love a good fight and I think we've had a good deal of fun with this tonight so, thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes' and 30 'nays'.... on this question there are 30 'ayes' and 92 'nays', I'm sorry. Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "I now move we nonconcur and ask for a second..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we do not adopt the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

First Conference Committee Report to House Bill-1508 and moves for a Second Conference Committee Report. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, on that motion. All right the motion is adopted then. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, arise?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for unanimous consent...."

Speaker Bradley: "I can't hear you, Sir."

Wolf: "I would ask leave of the House to have my vote changed on the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 741, I voted 'yes', I just read it... I would like to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "You will have to come down to the well to do that. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. I don't... look I'm afraid that request was in before by Mr. Porter and it is impossible to be doing those things."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out something to you. You are a signer of the Conference Committee Report and...."

Speaker Bradley: "Who is, Sir?"

Ewell: "You are.... Bradley, 1508."

Speaker Bradley: "Right."

Ewell: "And what I'm pointing out to the Members of the Body... for you to recognize those who are going to concur with you and slide this thing through the particular House, to me seems to be a little bit of an arbitrary and capricious use of power of the Chair. It's what you call unfair, unreasonable and undemocratic and I always try to support the Chair. And I would like to see you in the Chair a little more often, but I should also point out that if your conduct continues along this line there are going to be a number of us who are going to object."

Speaker Bradley: "You are absolutely right in every point but one, Mr. Ewell, I was not successful. House Bill 1829, Mr. Collins. House Bill 2069, Representative Antonovych. House Bill... Senate Bill 881, Miss Catania."



Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The First Conference Committee Report is very nice and it was signed by all ten Members, but I'm afraid I have to move not to concur with it because we need another Conference Committee Report to change the effective date."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine. She moves to not adopt Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 881. All in favor of the Lady's motion say 'aye'. And the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on that motion."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates that she will."

Catania: "Be happy to answer any questions I can."

Schlickman: "Well, I think this is interesting that we have a Conference Committee Report that is unanimous but we have a Member of the House suggesting we don't accept the Report."

Speaker Bradley: "No, no, she's.... because of the effective date, I think is what she said. They do not have an effective date on it. She wants to put an effective date on it."

Schlickman: "Well, it'll be effective October 1 or December 1, what's wrong with that? That's the uniform effective date."

Catania: "It's a Bill that was requested by the..."

Speaker Bradley: "Effective next July."

Catania: "It was requested by the Department of Children and Family Services. The Chair has ruled that it would not be effective that soon unless we go to a Conference Committee and specifically put in an effective date. So the Department of Children and Family Services has requested that we go to a Second Conference Committee solely for the purpose of putting in an effective date since we did not act on it before midnight, June 30."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Lady's motion... Mr. Schlickman has removed all objections that he might have. And now all in favor of the Lady's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and a Second Conference Committee will be appointed. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on an announcement."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you know, we all received an invitation to the mansion this evening. Well, don't show, Teddy. The invitation was sent with



the intention that it would be the final evening of legislation and the invitation is still good when we adjourn, but we haven't adjourned. And when we do, if it's tomorrow, then the invitation still holds. And that's the message from the First Lady and the Governor. You're all welcome when we adjourn."

Speaker Bradley: "We have messages from the Senate. All right, the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I just had an interesting thought. Since the Governor had invited us over, you know, I haven't seen in the paper where he'd ever been shivareed and that's an old southern Illinois custom. We ought to go do it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, on a shivaree."

Lechowicz: "Well, I've been down to southern Illinois and never heard of a shivaree, but I'm willing to learn. And to my good colleague from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, since I'm looking at the invitation from the Governor and his lovely wife, if the Clerk doesn't have any other form of business and there are no announcements, I move that we..."

Speaker Bradley: "Give... ten minutes in perfunct..."

Lechowicz: "We'll give the Clerk ten minutes in perfunctory Session."

But, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now stand adjourned till..."

Speaker Bradley: "Recess for ten minutes and then adjourn."

Lechowicz: "Till eleven o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion..."

Lechowicz: "This morning."

Speaker Bradley: "This morning. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'."

We'll recess for ten minutes and then stand in adjournment. We stand in recess till eleven o'clock. Thank you, Mr. Schwartz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading. House Bill 2425."

A Bill for an Act to exempt from taxation receipts from the sales of gas or electricity to units of local government. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2426, Bowman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill Messages from the Senate. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their



Amendment and request a First Conference Committee on House Bill 2361, House Bill 689. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has acceded to the request for a Conference Committee on Senate Bills 496, 1208, 926, 327, 735, 1301, 1039, 752. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the Governor's specific recommendation for change to Senate Bill 1143 and further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following copy of the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee and requests a Second on Senate Bill 1209. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has receded from the request of the House for a Conference Committee on Senate Bill 830, Senate Bill 1025, Senate Bill 345, Senate Bill 322, Senate Bill 110, Senate Bill 293, Senate Bill 801, Senate Bill 728, Senate Bill 305. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the First Conference Committee on House Bill 1102, House Bill 1182, House Bill 1829, House Bill 2306. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following title. House Bill 2422 and 2424. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm



directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2414. Passed by the Senate, June 30, 1977 by three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request for Conference Committee on Senate Bill 29, Senate Bill 1142, House Bill... Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments to House Bill 2032 and request a Conference Committee and House Bill 1222, House Bill 1098, House Bill 299 and House Bill 391. Action taken by the Senate, June 30, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business, the House stands in recess till eleven a.m."



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 1. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|----|
| | 9:30 | Speaker Redmond | House to order | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Prayer Reads Agreed Resolutions | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Giorgi | Explains and moves adoption | |
| 2 | | Speaker Redmond | Agreed Resolutions are adopted | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Reads Messages from Senate | |
| 3 | | Speaker Redmond | At ease till 10:00 a.m. | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Announcements | |
| 4 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Leinenweber | | |
| | 11:35 | Clerk O'Brien | Messages from Senate | |
| 5 | | Speaker Redmond | House to order | |
| | 12:18 | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Messages from the Senate | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| 6 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Flinn | Introduction | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | E. Barnes | Motion to table | |
| 7 | | Speaker Redmond | Tabled, Roll Call for att. | |
| | | Madigan | Excused absences | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| 8 | | Speaker Redmond | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 2. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| | | Lechowicz | S.B. 742, 3rd Rdg. | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Schlickman | Yield? | |
| | | Lechowicz | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Walsh | Explains vote | |
| 10 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | 12:33 | Ewell | Vote present | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Robinson | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Friedrich | | |
| 11 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | E. Barnes | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Walsh requests verification Lechowicz requests poll of absentees. | |
| | | Kempiners | Charge to present | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk Hall | Polls absentees | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | McMaster | | |
| 12 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Tipsword | Present | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | J. Dunn | Present | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk Hall | Verifies Aff. Roll Call | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 3. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---|----|
| | | Walsh | Questions Aff. Roll Call | |
| 13, 14 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk Hall | | |
| 15 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Stiehl | Change to aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Walsh | | |
| 16 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Kent | Aye | |
| | | Willer | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | S.B. 752 passed | |
| | 12:48 | Edgar | S.B. 926, H.A. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | House refuse to recede | |
| | | Madison | | |
| | | Houlihan | H.B. 1222, S.A. #1 | |
| 17 | | Speaker Redmond | Nonconcur | |
| | 12:50 | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Schlickman | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Steczo | Asks about Cubs | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | S.B. 322, nonconcurrence | |
| 18 | | Abramson | Moves not recede S.A. 1, 2, 3 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Motion carries; S.B. 237 | |
| | | McMaster | Moves not rec. H.A. 1,2,3,6 and for Conference Committee | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Motion carries | |
| | | McMaster | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 4. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|----|
| | | Speaker Bradley | S.B. 345 | |
| | | Ebbesen | Conf. Com and moves not recede | |
| | 12:53 | Speaker Bradley | Motion carries; 735 | |
| | | Kempiners | Do not recede S.A. 1 & 4 and Conference Committee | |
| 19 | | Speaker Bradley | Motion carries, 937-TOOR | |
| | | McPike | 1203, nonconcur - TOOR | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | 1208 | |
| | | Macdonald | Recede H.A. 1 & 2, Conf. Com. | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Motion carries; S.B. 1281-TOOR | |
| | | Conti | Question on H.B. 933, Conference Committee | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Response; announcements | |
| 20 | | Clerk O'Brien | Announcements | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Leverenz | Announcement | |
| | 1:00 | Speaker Bradley | S.B. 1203 | |
| | | McPike | Refuse to recede H.A.1 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Motion... | |
| | | Mann | Announcement | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Conf. Com. Report; H.B. 168-TOOR | |
| | | Kelly | H.B. 822 adopt Conf. Com. Rep. #1 | |
| 21 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | 1:05 | Ebbesen | Request explanation, opposes | |
| 22 | | Kelly | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Conti | | |
| 23 | | Speaker Bradley | | |



| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 5. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|----|
| | | Stuffle | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Stuffle | Question | |
| | | Kelly | Response | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Williams | | |
| 24 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Tuerk | Question | |
| | | Kelly | Discussion | |
| 25 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Steczo | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Mahar | | |
| 26 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | 1:21 | Byers | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Deavers | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Kelly | To close | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 27 | | Dyer | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Hart | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Anderson | Question | |
| | | Kelly | Discussion | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

6.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|--|--|
| 28 | | Speaker Bradley Hudson Speaker Bradley Kelly Speaker Bradley Hudson Speaker Bradley Satterthwaite | |
| 29 | 1:30 | Speaker Bradley Kelly Speaker Bradley Griesheimer | Motion fails Request 2nd Con. Com. H.B. 168, C.C.R. #1 |
| 30 | | Speaker Bradley Porter Speaker Bradley Terzich Speaker Bradley | House adopts C.C.R. #1 Point of order H.B. 659, C.C.R. #1 |
| 31 | | Tipsword Speaker Bradley Von Boeckman Speaker Bradley Leinenweber Von Boeckman Speaker Bradley | House adopts H.B. 979, C.C.R. #1 Explains C.C.R. House adopts C.C.R. #1 |
| 32 | | Leverenz Speaker Bradley | H.B. 1001, C.C.R. #1 House adopts |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

7.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| | | Taylor | H.B. 2355, C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Friedrich | Question |
| 33 | | Taylor | Take out of record |
| | | Deuster | S.B. 325, C.C.R. #1 |
| 34 | 1:42 | Speaker Bradley | House adopts |
| | | Taylor | H.B. 2355, C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Bradley | House adopts |
| | | Klosak | S.B. 322, C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Wolf | Question |
| | | Klosak | Discussion |
| 35 | | Speaker Bradley | House adopts |
| | | Ryan | S.B. 337, C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Ebbesen | Question |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Cunningham | Responds |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Ebbesen | Repeats question |
| 36 | | Cunningham | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Bradley | House adopts |
| | | Mahar | S.B. 339, C.C.R. #1 |
| 37 | | Speaker Bradley | House adopts |
| | | Wikoff | S.B. 543, C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 8. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|----|
| | | Lechowicz | Yield? | |
| 38 | | Wikoff | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ebbesen | | |
| 39 | | Lechowicz | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Wikoff | | |
| 40 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ebbesen | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | E. Barnes | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | 2:00 | Wolf | Yield? | |
| | | Wikoff | Discussion | |
| 41 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Peters | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | House adopts | |
| | | Bluthardt | Inquiry | |
| 42 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Collins | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Houlihan | | |
| 43 | | Speaker Bradley | S.B. 116, AM. #2 | |
| | | Campbell | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Skinner | | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 9. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|----|
| 44 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Terzich | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | motion fails | |
| | | Terzich | Move to table S.B. 116, Hold on Nonconurrence | |
| 45 | 2:10 | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ewing | S.B. 1209, C.C.R. #2 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Stuffle | Yield? | |
| 46 | | Ewing | Discussion | |
| 47 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Polk | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Giorig | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | McClain | Yield? | |
| 48 | | Ewing | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Satterthwaite | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Totten | Point of order | |
| 49 | | Satterthwaite | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Giorgi | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ewing | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Take out of the record | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 10. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----|
| | | Schuneman | S.B. 364, H.A. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 50 | | Levin | | |
| | | Schuneman | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Madigan | Take out of the record? | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Schuneman | | |
| | | Madigan | Withdraws request | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | 2:22 | Totten | Question | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | House recesses | |
| | | Hudson | Leave to vote aye on S.B. 752 | |
| 51 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Keats | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Telcser | S.B. 495, H.A. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Skinner | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | House recesses | |
| 52 | | Darrow | S.B. 693, H.A. #2 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | McMaster | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 53 | | McMaster | Speaks to Bill | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Walsh | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 11. |
|-------------|-------------|---|---|-----|
| 54 | | Speaker Bradley Conti Bluthardt | | |
| 55 | | Speaker Bradley Schlickman | | |
| 56 | | Speaker Bradley Geo-Karis | | |
| 57 | | Speaker Bradley Darrow Speaker Bradley | To close | |
| 58 | | Kane Speaker Bradley Darrow Brady Speaker Bradley | Explains vote Motion fails Requests Con. Com. S.B. 830, H.A. #2 House recedes | |
| 59 | 2:45 | Speaker Bradley | Report on election contest Riccolo - Breslin | |
| 60 | | Speaker Redmond Laurino | Adams-Brinkmeier | |
| 61 | | Speaker Redmond Bluthardt Speaker Redmond Adams Speaker Redmond | | |
| 62 | | Laurino | Report on Breslin qualifications | |
| 63 | 2:50 | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 64 | | Bluthardt | Move to adopt Minority Report | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 12. |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----|
| 65 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 66 | | Mugalian | Reads his report | |
| 67 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 68 | | bradley | Support Majority Report | |
| 69 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 70, 71 | | Collins | Urges adoption of Minority Report | |
| 72 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Tipsword | Support Majority Report | |
| 73 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 74, 74, 76, 77, 78 | | Deuster | | |
| 79 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 80 | | Katz | Support Majority Report | |
| 81 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 82 | | McClain | Support Majority Report | |
| 83 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | O'Brien | Support Majority Report | |
| 84 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Willer | | |
| 85 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 86 | 3:54 | Friedrich | Seat | |
| 87 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Hart | | |
| 88 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Griesheimer | Unseat | |
| 89 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 90 | | Madison | Undecided | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 13. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----|
| 91 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Sandquist | Vote to seat her | |
| 92 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 93 | | Ewell | Vote to seat | |
| 94 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 95 | | McBroom | Vote to seat | |
| 96 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 97, 98 | | McGrew | Vote to unseat | |
| 99 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Stiehl | | |
| 100 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Steczo | Support Majority Report | |
| 101 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Geo-Karis | Vote to seat? | |
| 102 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 103, 104 | | Corneal Davis | Vote to seat | |
| 105 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Hoxsey | | |
| 106 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Brummer | | |
| 107 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 108 | | Macdonald | | |
| 109 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Stuffle | | |
| 110 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | 4:58 | Mahar | | |
| 111 | | Speaker Redmond | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 14. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|-----|
| | | Taylor | Moves previous question | |
| 112 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Conti | Point of personal privilege | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Previous question prevails | |
| 113 | | Bluthardt | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Matijevich | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Madison | Point of order | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Lechowicz | | |
| | 5:07 | Speaker Redmond | Oral Verified Roll Call | |
| 114 | | Madigan | Explain motion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Motion to accept Minority Report to unseat | |
| 115, 116 | | Bluthardt | To close | |
| 117 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 118 | | Sevcik | Parliamentary inquiry | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Oral Roll Call | |
| | | Abramson | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Oral Roll Call | |
| | | Adams | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Anderson | | |
| 119 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Antonovych | Present | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 15. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| | | E. Barnes | Present | |
| 120 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| | | Birchler | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| | | Boucek | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 121 | 5:18 | Bowman | Aye | |
| 122 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Bradley | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Brady | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Brandt | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Brummer | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Byers | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Caldwell | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Capparelli | Aye | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 16. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Catania | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Chapman | No | |
| 123 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Christensen | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Collins | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Cunningham | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Darrow | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | C. Davis | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | J. Davis | Aye | |
| 124 | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Dawson | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Deavers | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Deuster | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| | | DiPrima | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 17. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|
| | | J. Dunn | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Dyer | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Ebbesen | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Ewell | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Ewing | Yes | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Flinn | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Friedland | Aye | |
| 125 | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Gaines | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| 126 | | Geo-Karis | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Getty | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Giorgi | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Greiman | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 18. |
|-------------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|-----|
| | | Hoffman | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | D. Houlihan | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | J. Houlihan | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Huff | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Johnson | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| 127 | | J. Jones | Present | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Kempiners | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| | | Lechowicz | Aye | |
| 128 | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| | | Levin | No | |
| 129 | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Lucco | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Madison | Hung Jury | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Mann | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Marovitz | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 19. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 130 | | Matijik | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Matijeovich | No | |
| 131 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Mautino | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| 132 | | Mudd | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Mulcahey | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | O'Brien | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | 5:55 | Pechous | | |
| 133 | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Peters | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Pullen | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Ryan | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Satterthwaite | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Sevcik | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| 134 | | Simms | Aye | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 20. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Sumner | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Proceeds | |
| | | Taylor | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Terzich | | |
| 135 | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Totten | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Vitek | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Von Boeckman | Yes | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Madison | | |
| 136 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Waddell | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Walsh | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Willer | Aye | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | No | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 21. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----|
| | | P. Martin | Present | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Matijevec | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | E. Jones | No | |
| 137 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | DiPrima | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Friedrich | Change to Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Beatty | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 138 | 6:10 | Rigney | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | E. Jones | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | O'Brien | | |
| 139 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Jacobs | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Stearney | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Greiman | Parliamentary inquiry | |
| 140 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Peters | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Motion carries, seat vacated | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 22. |
|------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|-----|
| | | Breslin | | |
| 141 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Bluthardt | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Giglio | Question | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | House recess House to order | |
| 142 | | | | |
| 143, 144, 145, 146 147 | | Clerk Hall | Messages from the Senate | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk Hall | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Leverenz | | |
| | | Clerk Hall | | |
| | 7:12 | Wolf | Regarding Conf. Com. report, Won't sign it | |
| Tape III | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 148 | | Yourell | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | H.B. 1, Nonconcurrence | |
| | | Vitek | Comments about the Senate | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 149 | | Ryan | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Telcser | S.B. 496, nonconcurrence | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Motion carries | |
| | | Flinn | No Calendars | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 23. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----|
| | | Brummer | S.B. 1301, nonconcurrence | |
| 150 | | Speaker Redmond | Motion carries | |
| | | | S.B. 1342, nonconcurrence | |
| | | Hart | Question | |
| | | Bartulis | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Skinner | | |
| 151 | | Speaker Redmond | Motion carries | |
| | | Deavers | S.B. 1367, nonconcurrence | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Leinenweber | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Deavers | | |
| | | Leinenweber | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Motion carries | |
| | | Madigan | H.B. 1833, concurrence | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Skinner | | |
| 152 | | Madigan | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Ebbesen | Wants order | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Discussion | |
| | | Matijevich | Wants recall of S.B. 1367 | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Schlickman | Objects to 1833 | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Discussion | |
| | | Ebbesen | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 24. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----|
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 153 | | Mann | Yield? | |
| | 8:00 | Madigan | Discussion | |
| 154 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Skinner | Yield? | |
| 155 | | Madigan | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Tipsword | Yield? | |
| | | Madigan | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | J. Houlihan | | |
| 156 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Byers | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Mudd | | |
| 157 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Harris | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Bartulis | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Polls absentees | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Daniels | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 25. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|-----|
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Affirmative Roll Call | |
| | | Kozubowski | Leave to be verified | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Harris | Leave to be verified | |
| 158 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | 8:15 | Katz | Aye, verified | |
| | | Schlickman | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 159 | | Byers | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Madigan | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Matijevich | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Houlihan | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| 160 | 8:19 | Matijevich | S.B. 1362, H.A. #1, Move to reconsider vote | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | J. Houlihan | Parliamentary inquiry Move it lay on table | |
| | | Matijevich | | |
| 161 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Skinner | Point of order | |
| | 8:22 | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Schlickman | Point of personal privilege | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 26. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--|-----|
| 162 | | Speaker Redmond | Houlihan's motion | |
| | | Sandquist | | |
| 163 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | J. Houlihan | Poll absentees | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Keats | Point of order | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Johnson | Asks Chair rule dilatory | |
| 164 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Ewell | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Mann | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Abramson | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Bernett | Aye | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Keats | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Schisler | No | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Peters | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | 8:30 | Deavers | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Dump the Roll Call, Motion to table fails | |
| 165 | | J. Houlihan | Poll absentees | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 27. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----|
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | McBroom | | |
| 166 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | J. Houlihan | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Matijevich | Withdraw motion to reconsider | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Peters | Clear the floor | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Kane | S.B. 2347, S.A. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | House nonconcur | |
| 167 | | Brady | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Messages from Senate | |
| 168 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Brady | H.B. 689, S.A. #1 | |
| 169 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Stuffle | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Hoffman | | |
| 170 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | 8:47 | Ewell | | |
| 171 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Yourell | | |
| | | Brady | Discussion | |
| 172 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Ryan | Opposes | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 28. |
|-------------|-------------|--|----------------------------------|-----|
| 173 | | Lechowicz in the Chair Caldwell | | |
| 174 | | Speaker Lechowicz Friedrich Speaker Lechowicz Darrow | Moves previous question | |
| 175 | | Speaker Lechowicz Brady Speaker Lechowicz Brady | TV cameras are on To close | |
| 176 | | Speaker Lechowicz Levin | | |
| 177 | | Speaker Lechowicz Madison Speaker Lechowicz Peters | Explains vote | |
| 178 | 9:07 | Speaker Lechowicz J. Houlihan Speaker Lechowicz Ebbesen | | |
| 179 | | Speaker Lechowicz E. Jones Speaker Lechowicz Ewing Speaker Lechowicz | Explains vote House nonconcur | |
| 180 | | Brady Speaker Lechowicz | Asks for Conf. Com. | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

29.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--|
| | | Ewing | Votes no |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Hanahan | H.B. 2361, S.A. #1,2,4,5 Nonconcurrence |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| 181 | | Hanahan | Explains |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House Nonconcur |
| | | Deuster | Votes no on H.B. 689 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Leave granted |
| | | Brummet | H.B. 818, Am. #1 and 2 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | H.B. 818, House concurs |
| 182 | | J. Houlihan | H.B. 2398, S.A. # 1 and 2 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House concurs |
| | | Madigan | H.B. 1429, S.A. #1 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House concurs |
| 183 | | Bowman | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | McAuliffe | H.B. 1102, 1st Conf. Com. Report |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Levin | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | McAuliffe | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House concurs |
| 184 | | Huskey | H.B. 1182 |
| 185 | | Speaker Lechowicz | Take out of record |
| | | Hanahan | H.B. 1412, Conf. Com. Report #1 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 30. |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----|
| | | Byers | Yield? | |
| 186 | | Hanahan | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Keats | Moves previous question | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Matijeovich | Explains vote | |
| 187 | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts C.C.R. #1 | |
| | | Schlickman | Sports | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Mautino | Point of information | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | 8:32 | Hoffman | H.B. 419, C.C.R. #1 | |
| 188 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Keats | Yield | |
| | | Hoffman | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adonts C.C.R. #1 | |
| | | Terzich | S.B. 997, H.A. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House refuses to recede | |
| 189 | | Mann | H.B. 2089 | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House concurs | |
| | | Huskey | H.B. 1182, yield to Mautino | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Mautino | Asks for concurrence | |
| 190 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Yourell | Yield | |
| | | Mautino | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 31. |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----|
| | | Yourell | Speaks on the Bill | |
| | | Mautino | Responds to Yourell | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Huskey | | |
| 192 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | 9:37 | Bradley | | |
| 193 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Neff | | |
| | | Mautino | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Marovitz | | |
| 194 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Deavers | Moves previous question | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Neff | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Yourell | No vote | |
| 195 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Chapman | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Kent | Discussion | |
| 196 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Mautino | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Chapman | Point of order | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 32. |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---|-----|
| | | Leverenz | Explains vote | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| 197 | | Pullen | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | 9:55 | Skinner | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Yourell | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| 198 | | Chapman | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts C.C.R. #1 | |
| 199 | | Waddell | H.B. 1062, C.C.R. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts | |
| | | Stanley | H.B. 2179 | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Daniels | Yield? | |
| 200 | | Stanley | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Conti | Yield? | |
| | | Stanley | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Stanley | To close | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts C.C.R. #1 | |
| 201 | | Meyer | H.B. 2306, leave to place on Interim Study | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | McClain | Why? | |
| | | Meyer | Discussion | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

33.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | H.B. 2306, Interim Study |
| | 10:07 | Rigney | S.B. 153 |
| 202 | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Tuerk | Yield? |
| | | Rigney | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Mulcahey | Yield? |
| 203 | | Rigney | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Matijevec | |
| 204 | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Rigney | To close |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts C.C.R. #1 |
| | | J. Davis | S.B. 880, C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts C.C.R. #1 |
| 205 | | Polk | Introduces Jack Beaupre |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Schlickman | Cub score |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Madigan | H.B. 1428, 1st C.C.R. |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Take out of record |
| | | Skinner | H.B. 44, C.C.R. #1 |
| 206 | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | J. Houlihan | Question |
| 207 | | Skinner | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Take out of record |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

34.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| | | Laurino | S.B. 964 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Schlickman | Yield? |
| 208 | | Laurino | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Wolf | |
| 209 | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Schlickman | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| 10:26 | | Laurino | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | J. Houlihan | |
| 210 | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Madigan | H.B. 1428, C.C.R. |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Geo-Karis | Question |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Collins | |
| 211 | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | J. Houlihan | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Passed |
| | | Skinner | H.B. 44 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Skinner | |
| 212 | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Schneider | Yield? |
| | | Skinner | Discussion |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 35. |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Satterthwaite | Yield? | |
| 213 | | Skinner | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Waddell | Moves previous question | |
| | | Skinner | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Skinner | To close | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Passed | |
| | | Ewing | H.B. 1209, Nonconcurrence | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House nonconcurs | |
| | | Ewing | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Friedrich | H.B. 528, C.C.R. | |
| 214 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Hart | Question | |
| | | Friedrich | Discussion | |
| 215 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Conti | Yield? | |
| | | Friedrich | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Robinson | Question | |
| | | Friedrich | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | McBroom | Moves previous question | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 36. |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| 216 | | Friedrich | To close | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Giorgi | Explains vote | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Hoffman | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Wants some order | |
| | | Hoffman | Explains vote | |
| 217 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Friedrich | Explains vote | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Adopted | |
| | | Mahar | H.B. 1064, C.C.R. #1 | |
| 218 | | Speaker Lechowicz | House does not adopt | |
| | | Darrow | H.B. 611, C.C.R. #1 | |
| 219 | | Speaker Lechowicz | Concurs | |
| | | Macdonald | H.B. 1071, C.C.R. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Adopted | |
| | | Hoffman | S.B. 1281 | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House does not recede | |
| 220 | | Kelly | H.B. 822, C.C.R. #2 | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Conti | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| 221 | | Leverenz | Yield? | |
| | | Kelly | Discussion | |
| 222 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Mahar | | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

37.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|---|
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Steczo | Yield? |
| | | Kelly | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Kelly | To close |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Huff | |
| | 11:03 | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| 224 | | Bluthardt | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Kelly | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House does not adopt C.C.R. #2 H.B. 822 lost |
| | | Terzich | H.B. 840, C.C.R. #1 |
| 225 | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Waddell | H.B. 335, C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House adopts |
| | | D. Houlihan | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Ryan moves H.B. 2368, S.A. #1 and 2 |
| 226 | | Byers | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | J. Houlihan | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | |
| | | Ryan | Explains Amendment |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | Discussion |
| | | Matijevich | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 38. |
|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|
| 227 | | Ryan | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Tipsword | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Leverenz | | |
| | | Ryan | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | House concurs S.A. #1 and 2 | |
| | | Collins | H.B. 1109, C.C.R. #1 | |
| 228 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Leverenz | Yield? | |
| | 11:16 | Collins | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond in the Chair | House adopts | |
| | | Holewinski | H.B. 1105, C.C.R. #1 | |
| 229 | | Speaker Redmond | House adopts | |
| | | Lechowicz | H.B. 752 | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Walsh | Asks to repeat | |
| | | Lechowicz | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | J. Houlihan | | |
| | | Lechowicz | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Pullen | | |
| | | Lechowicz | Refuse to recede | |
| 231 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Young | Question | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 39. |
|-------------|-------------|--------------------|--|-----|
| | | Speaker Discussion | | |
| 232 | | Ryan | Take out of the record | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Kosinski | H.B. 1 | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | D. Houlihan | Point of order, question of germaneness of S.A. #2 | |
| 233 | 11:25 | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Ryan | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Pierce | | |
| 234 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Deuster | | |
| 235 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Matijevich | | |
| 236 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Schlickman | | |
| 237 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Porter | | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Schlickman | | |
| 238 | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Telcser | | |
| 239 | | Speaker Redmond | Rules S.A. #2 not germane | |
| 240 | | Ryan | Appeals the ruling of the Chair | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | D. Houlihan | | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

40.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Hart | Discussion |
| 241 | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Ryan | Poll absentees |
| | | Clerk O'Brien | Polls absentees |
| | | Kosinski | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Motion to overrule fails |
| 242 | | Kosinski | Move to nonconcur |
| | | Speaker Redmond | House nonconcur in H.B. 1 |
| | 11:50 | Bradley | Move to suspend Rule 68(e) |
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Daniels | How many votes required |
| | | Speaker Redmond | 107 votes, motion prevails |
| 243 | | Kempiners | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Bowman | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Lechowicz | H.B. 752 |
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Walsh | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| 244 | | Schlickman | Point of order |
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Friedrich | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | |
| | | Schlickman | Asks for description of Amendment |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 41. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---|-----|
| | | Speaker Redmond | | |
| | | Lechowicz | | |
| 245 | | Schlickman | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Redmond | Refuses to recede from Am. #2 | |
| | | Lechowicz | Am. #4 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Schlickman | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Refuse to recede from Am. #4 | |
| | | Lechowicz | Am. #18 | |
| 246 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Schlickman | Yield? | |
| | | Lechowicz | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Refuse to recede from Am. #18 | |
| | | Lechowicz | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Epton | Objects to hearing altogether | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Am. #22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 36, 38 - refuse to recede | |
| 247 | | Lechowicz | Am. #43 do recede | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | House recedes | |
| 248 | | Lechowicz | Am. #45 and 46 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Previais | |
| | | Lechowicz | Conference Committee | |
| | | Brummer | S.B. 1301 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Houlihan | Parliamentary inquiry | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 42. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----|
| | | Brummer | Nonconcur | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Does not adopt | |
| 249 | | Geo-Karis | Parliamentary inquiry | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Discussion | |
| | | Terzich | Question | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Discussion | |
| | | Geo-Karis | | |
| 250 | | Speaker Bradley | Discussion | |
| | | Collins | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | 12:15 | Houlihan | Moves suspension of rules | |
| 251 | | Speaker Bradley | Rule 68(d) | |
| | | Kane | Question - schedule | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 252 | | Greiman | S.B. 152, nonconcurrence | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Daniels | Question | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Discussion | |
| | | Greiman | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Daniels | Yield? | |
| 253 | | Greiman | Discussion | |
| 254 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Mautino | Question of Daniels | |
| | 12:23 | Daniels | Responds | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

43.

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| 255 | | Wikoff | |
| 256 | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Greiman | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Tuerk | Discussion |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Huff | |
| 257 | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Schuneman | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Holewinski | Moves previous question |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Greiman | To close |
| 258 | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | J. Dunn | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Friedrich | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Motion prevails |
| 259 | | Wikoff | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| | | Kelly | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | H.B. 1216 |
| | | Bluthardt | C.C.R. #1 |
| | | Speaker Bradley | |
| 260 | | Tipsword | Question |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Discussion H.B. 1216 adopted |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 44. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----|
| | | Bluthardt | H.B. 1217, C.C.R. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | adopted | |
| | | Porter | Vote yes on 1109 and 1428 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 261 | | Kucharski | H.B. 2030 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Kane | What's in it? | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Kucharski | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Kane | Yield? | |
| 262 | | Kucharski | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Houlihan | Parliamentary inquiry | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Kucharski | Take out of the record | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | S.B. 596 | |
| | | Houlihan | | |
| 263 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Mugalian | Yield? | |
| | | Houlihan | Answers | |
| | | Mugalian | Speaks to Bill | |
| 264 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Matijevich | Senate adjourned | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Skinner | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 45. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----|
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ewing | | |
| 265 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Meyer | Lost his shoes | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | R. Dunn | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Sandquist | | |
| 266 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Houlihan | To close | |
| 267 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Telcser | No | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Houlihan | Move nonconcurrence | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Adopted | |
| 268 | | Mudd | H.B. 741, C.C.R. #1 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Mugalian | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Houlihan | Objects | |
| | | Mudd | Explains further | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 269 | | Houlihan | | |
| 270 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Houlihan | Withdraws objection | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Adopts C.C.R. - S.B. 741 | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 46. |
|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-----|
| | | Bowman | H.B. 1508 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Bradley | Explains further | |
| 271 | | Speaker Lechowicz | | |
| | | Lauer | | |
| 272 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ewing | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 273 | | Walsh | | |
| 274 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | J. Dunn | Moves previous question | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Walsh | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Bowman | To close | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Bowman | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | C.C.R. #1 to 1508 lost | |
| | | Bowman | Moves nonconcur in 1508 | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | Adopted | |
| 275 | | Wolf | Change vote | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ewell | Discussion | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 276 | | Catania | S.B. 881 | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-30-77

| <u>Page</u> | <u>Time</u> | <u>Speaker</u> | <u>Information</u> | 47. |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----|
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Schlickman | Yield? | |
| | | Catania | Answer | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Ryan | | |
| 277 | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Tipsword | | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| | | Lechowicz | Moves recess till 11 o'clock | |
| | | Speaker Bradley | | |
| 278, 279 | | Clerk O'Brien | | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES