

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NINETY-SECOND LEGISLATIVE DAY

JUNE 19, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 19, 1975

JUN 19 1975

1.

Jack O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1683, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1725, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: "House Bill 1441. Together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1450, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in passage of Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1468, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1518, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1519, together with



with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1539, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1577, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1597, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1608, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1654, together with Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1536, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate

as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1291, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1697, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 18, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 14. Any Amendments on that?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendments on Senate Bill 14? Senate Bill 14. A Bill for an Act to provide for the regulation of hand guns, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1...550."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 550. A Bill for an Act amend an Act to...in relation to the form and cost of publications required by law. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 551."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 551. A Bill for an Act concerning fees and salaries. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 552."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 552. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative LaFleur on the Floor? Sevcik, Keller? McPartlin? Kornowicz, Terzich, Tipsword, 463."





Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 463. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning elections. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend Senate Bill 463 in the House on page 1, line 2, by deleting period and inserting in lieu thereof, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Chairman, I would like to move at this time to table Committee Amendment 1 for the reason that it has been drafted Committee Amend...or, there has been drafted another Amendment which is on file that incorporates all the provisions of Committee Amendment #1 and makes other substantive corrections in the law in three areas of the statutes of the State of Illinois to make the...this Amendment really effective. So I would now move to table Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to Comm...to table Committee Amendment #1 to House...Senate Bill 463. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is tabled."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Tipword. Amends Senate Bill 463 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Now, this Amendment does just exactly what was done in the Amendment that was adopted by the Committee but it does it in a correct fashion. It now provides in the Amendment to this Bill that in all Counties except in Cook County that vacancies in office, in County Elective Office and in precinct office shall be filled by nomination of individuals of the same political parties of those who have vacated the office by the County Central Committee or in the case of...ah...County Board Members, by the District Central Committee of that County District if the County is divided into districts for the election of Board Members or by County Central Committee if the County elects their Board Members at large and further makes provisions for the filling of vacancies in offices of County Commissioners again by virtue of the Election...of...ah...Election of people of the same political party. I move for the adoption of



Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 463. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments, Third Reading. Representative Washington is recognized for removing the suspension of Rule 21."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move the suspension of Rule 21 so the Judiciary I Committee, which is in the middle of a hearing on Medical Malpractice on which we served subpoenas and subpoenas do take some and they're being returned, we need about an hour and I move the suspension of the appropriate Rules so that we may take another hour and wrap up this business."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the suspension of the rule. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 'aye', no 'nay' the motion carries and the rule is suspended. In conjunction with that may the following Members be recorded on the Roll Call here. They're in attendance at Judiciary I. I can give them to the Clerk. No objection on the, putting them on the Roll Call, is there? Hearing none, they'll be put on the Roll Call. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 32. Calvo."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 32. A Bill for an Act creating a criminal and juvenile justice commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Six Committee Amendments. Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 32 on page 2 line 2 by changing 8 to 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Members...Members of the House. Senate Bill 32 has 6 Committee Amendments. I will try to be brief in the presentation of each one. Amendment #1 increases to twenty-two members by placing five public members in accordance with Federal Regulation. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 32. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Read the next Amendment."



Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Amends Senate Bill 32 on page 7 by striking all of line 3 through 11."

LaFleur: "Amendment #2 deletes the Public Policy Statement. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 32. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Amendment #3."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Amends Senate Bill 32 on page 8 by inserting immediately after line 12, the following. Section 16. This Act takes effect upon its becoming a law."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 32. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Amendment #4 Mr. Clerk....That was adopted. Amendment #4."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Amends Senate Bill 32 on page 4, line 15 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Amendment #4 brings the various regional planning...ah... coordinating council into play in helping to award the Federal Grants. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman...Representative Lechowicz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "Which council are you referring to Leo?"

LaFleur: "There's five of them Ted, and this is your Amendment."

Lechowicz: "It's not my Amendment. Which five are they?"

LaFleur: "There's six Amendments, this is 4. There's five councils yes, five areas. The City of Chicago makes up one area."

Lechowicz: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 32. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Amendment #5."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Amends Senate Bill 32 on page 5, line 12 and so forth."

LaFleur: "Amend...Amendment #5 formulizes the...the distribution of funds



it uses a formula both by population and by the intensity of crime. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #5. Representative Tipsword."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Tipsword: "Can you tell me what this is going to do to the grant programs in downstate judicial districts that...that exist at the present time and how they're going to be funded, how they're going to cut or they're going to be funded at the rate they're funded now or just...just where we're going to be. Because I think under the formula that's set forth in this it only gives...gives...ah...credence to population and to how high your crime rate is and has absolutely no relation to...ah...the funding of grants and programs that...that are existing or contemplated in the downstate areas of the state."

LaFleur: "Well I don't think anything that is ...existing already granted could be effected...ah...Rollie...I do believe in the future when you have the five different areas using their input...ah...instead of the state coming downward to your district it would be approved by your district and asked for by the state and then it would be formulized through this formula as to the need and the necessity of the grants. I don't know what your incident of crime and your population is...ah...but it would have the relationship of the two. The formula would take in, the two things into consideration."

Tipsword: "Well I think the incidents of crime is a very horrible means of...of...ah...overall generally deciding how you're going to fund various programs. I think a lot of the grant programs, a lot of the...the things that need to be funded under this...ah...Commission are all right, but they should not depend solely on a loan upon how unlawful the area that you live in may be. I would say that following this kind of a procedure you're probably going to, by virtue of of the cuts that will be effected, going to increase crimes in those



areas in which their...their programs have been trying to, to keep it down or to keep it within balance and I think have...have somewhat been successful and I think this is...is a disastrous thing for four of the five judicial districts in the State of Illinois. I think that...ah...people in the downstate, the rural districts, the...ah...small town districts are going to be pretty well cut out of this program by the formula you're suggesting in Amendment #5. The Commission itself already...that... that set up in this...this...ah...Senate Bill 32. Is a kind of a thing that it...it looks to cutting out about 90 per cent of the geographical area of the state and I think this really adds to it, it's a...a horrible formula."

LaFleur: "I...I do not know that I agree with you totally Rollie. I ...I probably do agree with you on the broad concept and I do not have the complete figures of what this...how this would effect each individual community or area, but we did run some sampling and we did find that...ah...some of the highest incidents...some of the highest rates...ah...relationship of money granted would be to downstate communities and that is because a very little, low crime index with a low population would have a high incident. So the East St. Louis, the Pontiac...ah...I...I hesitate to answer, you know directly, but we did sample some of these and I don't think we can take the first blush of this that all the money would go to one place. That is absolutely untrue, there is a definite relationship between population and incident of crime and I don't know that it's right but I'd be happy to work with you if you can devise something fair, better and...ah...more equitable."

Tipword: "Well I see here in your program that where there's 40 per cent of the population they're going to get well in excess of 55 per cent of the money...ah...It appears to me that this isn't serving the people of the State of Illinois very well and I would certainly suggest to the Membership of this General Assembly and especially those of you who live in Judicial districts 2, 3, 4 and 5, to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Sponsor of



the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Lundy: "Representative...ah...does the formula, the allocation formula which is proposed in this Amendment replace some other allocation formula that's presently in the Bill or is it an effort to replace ...ah...descretionary grants with a...ah...with a distributive formula of some sort?"

LaFleur: "Well...ah...Joe, on the Bill itself, House Bill 32. Makes a statutory Commission out of an executive Commission. Now the executive Commission, ILEC that exists now...ah...does have discretionary powers and the question, does this replace something that's in the Bill. No it does not because discretionary powers were left in the Bill originally in House Bill...I mean in Senate Bill 32."

Lundy: "So the effect of this Amendment would be to replace...ah...awarding of discretionary grants by...ah...statutor...statutorily created Commission with a statutory allocation formula. Is that right?"

LaFleur: "That...That is right. To take the discretionary powers in a new Comission and formulize them."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would speak against this Amendment. The whole thrust of the...ah...on the bus crime control and safe streets Act. It's a Federal level and...ah... efforts that have been made in this state over the last several years have been in the direction of attempting to encourage and facilitate criminal justice planning. That's the purpose of the... the grants that are made now and in order to have that work effectively I think you have to have in the state grant making agency the power to evaluate the planning process of the...the effectiveness of that planning process that's going on at the local level. I don't think you'll get that kind of...ah...evaluation at the state level...ah... If you require that funds be distributed through a statutory formula and I would ask for a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I wholeheartedly agree with Representative Lundy when he states that there certainly is a need for a reform and a modernization of the criminal justice system in our state, and certainly we should avail ourself of the federal funds that are available to effectuate that reform. However, what the distinguished Representative failed to bring out, is that the current method of distribution of the funds has miserably failed. If there are local crime commissions throughout the state, ready, willing, and able to receive these funds and to implement them, but because of actions of the State Commission, for whatever reasons they may be, this has not happened. The funds have not flowed through. The funds are being held in Springfield. Millions and millions of dollars are sitting here. They're not being used in your local communities to fight crime. And certainly, as locally elected officials, we are concerned with crime. So that if you are concerned about fighting crime in your community, vote for this Amendment, provide that the federal money will flow through, down your community and help to effectuate the reforms that we all want. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Gentlemen, I don't think we need it. You ready for the question?" The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 32. All in favor of the adoption vote 'aye', say 'aye' rather... 'aye', opposed 'no'. I can't determine that. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 59 'ayes', 27 'no', the Motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "Amendment #6. Amend Senate Bill 32 on page 7, line 12, by striking the number 13, and inserting in lieu thereof, 12, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "This is merely a technical Amendment where we're changing numbers in the Bill and I would move for the adoption."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. LaFleur, who's the Legislative Advisory Committee?"

LaFleur: "Who is...?"

Giorgi: "Yeah, who is...?"

LaFleur: "Is that in the Amendment that we're talking about?"

Giorgi: "I don't know, it's in the Bill somewhere, and I wondered if this Amendment affects that, but...ah...I'm curious anyway."

LaFleur: "No, it...it...it."

Giorgi: "Don't you know who the Legislative Advisory Committee is?"

LaFleur: "Well, I know this creates a Legislative Advisory Committee if the Bill is passed, but I don't know that one exists at the time, I, ah...Zeke."

Giorgi: "I thought you were just creating a criminal injustice...Juvenile Justice Commission."

LaFleur: "Well, the Bill does, but I thought we were talking about Amendment #6."

Giorgi: "Senate Amendment #1 requires the Legislative Advisory Committee meet joi...."

LaFleur: "That's in the Bill, Zeke."

Giorgi: "Do you know who they are?"

LaFleur: "Who they are? No, they would be created after the...ah...if the Bill is passed."

Giorgi: "Is there any indication...ah...has...ah...are you familiar with the crime rates since the Law Enforcement Commission came into being?"

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

Madigan: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Madigan: "Would the Gentleman from Winnebago address himself to the Amendment with intelligent questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think you are correct. Address yourself to the Amendment."

Giorgi: "That's right, Mr. Speaker, we don't want to get both hands in the trough. Forget the crime rates, let's grab the money. What is the importance of the Amendment, Mr. LaFleur, you haven't said that yet?"





LaFleur: "Well, I...I do not have the Bill right here, but I will get it, well, I just, I just found it, I just found it, and we will go down it piece by piece and tell you what we are changing."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #6, to Senate Bill 32. All in favor of the adoption vote 'aye'...signify by saying 'aye'... 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 16."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 16, Calvo."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo, 16."

O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to establish the Board of Trustees of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment's from the Floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Ebbesen. Amend Senate Bill 16 on page 1, by deleting line 1 through 4, and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah...yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah...the Amendment that I have here...ah...would create a Board for an addition to the one that is proposed in the basic Bill on the Edwardsville campus at Southern Illinois University. It would create a Board of Trustees at Northern Illinois University. Now this type of legislation proposal is something that I had given a great deal of thought to...ah...Northern Illinois University of course is located in DeKalb, and in the northern section of the State, which is the most populous area geographically, and...ah...I...ah...had thought about proposing this sometime in the Fall of the Session next year. However, when I saw this particular piece of legislation come by, I went to the Legislative Reference Bureau, and in the meantime, I dug out some information that I think...ah...makes the adoption of this Amendment almost mandatory. If the Edwardsville campus which has a enrollment a little over 13,000 students as



compared to 19,000 at Southern Illinois in Carbondale. Northern Illinois University has an enrollment this year of over 25,000 students, and...ah...if we compare on an enrollment basis, the...ah...total of all those students in Higher Education, you will find that the Edwardsville campus is just a little over two percent in that at Northern we have almost a five percent total. Also, as far as the number of graduate students in the...ah...most recent...ah...1974-75 year, we'll find that the number of degrees that the graduates is more than double on these two campuses. Ah...the number of faculty and total employees is almost tripled at Northern. Ah...the total appropriation, and this is where I think that some of the Legislators in the Northern section of the state should be paying very close attention, that the total appropriation at Southern...ah...for Southern at Carbondale is almost seventy million dollars, and a little less than thirty million at the Edwardsville campus, and Northern only has an appropriation of forty-six million dollars, and when you compare geographically...ah...this University, the people that it serves, the number of students, I think...ah...that if we are going to have creation of any Board of Trustees for any University, in this state, that the number one priority is Northern Illinois University, and therefore I would be happy to field any questions and I would also ask for a favorable vote on the Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for your defeat of Amendment #1, and in supporting my suggestion that you defeat the Amendment, I would just point out that the Gentleman may have some valid points, but they do not apply. He talks about the only reason that Northern should have their own separate Board the same as SIU at Edwardsville, is the number of employees are tripled, and their enrollment is much larger. That is not, at all the basis for the fact that Southern Illinois at Edwardsville should have their own Board of Trustees. He talks farther, that if any University is going to have a separate Board, Northern should have it. Well, Southern already has a separate Board of Trustees that operates both campuses. And, frankly, that is where the problem arises. The



reason for the problem is this. The most important function I firmly believe of either the elected Board that we have or any other Board of Trustees in this state is the input they have into the community their University serves, whether it be statewide or otherwise. Could I have a little order Mr. Speaker? In addition to that, the input from the people to the University and the input back from the University to the people. That's the most important function they serve. And how can a Board that's made up of members that serve SIU Carbondale which has an enrollment of some 20,000 and has all, virtually all those students living on campus, 99% of them, also relate to the problems of the community where all the students, I submit all the students are commuters. There's not a campus on site, facility where any student can live at at SIU Edwardsville. Ninety...eighty-five percent of those students come from my district and the district adjacent from two counties. They work, sixty-five percent of them work, full time and support a family. Nearly all of them are first generation college students. These kind of problems that need relativity to the community and from the community back to the University cannot be served by Southern Illinois members of Boards of Trustees who have written you all a letter and sent you all an editorial that he had placed in a particular newspaper. He has no idea of the needs of this community, he has no idea of these students. He knows about the students that reside in the dorm; he knows how to handle a University that has all live-in students, but he does not know the problems of the community of East St. Louis and St. Clair and Madison counties, there students. He does not have any idea how to relate back to those people the University problems of SIU or the problems of the community, and for that reason, this is completely different than the Northern situation, and I submit that Northern is in the Board of Regents, and not at all related to the problem we're addressing here, and I respectfully ask you to defeat of the Gentleman's Amendment. Perhaps, as he said, he has an idea that's good, and if he can come before us later with his own Bill, which he suggests that he intends to do, and then we can decide that issue, but it has no relation to this issue, and should



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

not be part of this Bill, and I respectfully ask your support in defeating the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

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

I, too, rise to oppose this Amendment #1. The Representative from DeKalb has mentioned that he thought of introducing this proposal in the Fall, and I think, perhaps, that would be a more proper way, and a more proper time to do so. Whatever the merits are...ah...of the University up at DeKalb, I think they should be considered strictly upon their own merits and their own set of circumstances. That University is different in size, it's different in many of the problems that it has to contend with and the educational goals that it has, and I think whatever merits it has should be considered separately, perhaps, in the Fall, as he has indicated. I think that this Bill that we are now considering should stand or fall upon its own merits, upon its own set of circumstances, and I do not think that as responsible legislators here today, that we should confuse this issue, that we should complicate this Bill by introducing a completely different set of circumstances as it relates to another University in the state. I say that this Bill should stand or fall upon its own merits, upon its own set of circumstances and I would emphatically urge you to vote no on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. You seek recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect to Representative Ebbesen in this area, I do think that we should accord to Representative Calvo, the privilege of having his Bill in the shape he wishes to have it in when it reaches Third Reading. Accordingly, I will urge a no vote on Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, will Representative Calvo yield to a question as principal Sponsor of this Bill...House Sponsor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Sure."

Cunningham: "Ah...Representative Calvo, by some strange coincidence, I have an Amendment being prepared for Eastern Illinois University at Charleston. Would it be an imposition for you to hold this Bill that



I might have an opportunity to...to offer it here on Second Reading or would you bring it back from Third."

Calvo: "Roscoe, I think it would be an imposition. I've held this Bill on Second Reading, for what I thought was an inordinant<sup>l</sup> length of time, so you can have all the Amendments you want, I think we have eight now, and...ah...it's my position that the Bill should rise or fall on its own merits and I would have to oppose your Amendment for that reason. I don't think I should bring it back."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, if I might speak on the Bill for a moment."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Amendment."

Cunningham: "On the Amendment. I am pleased to discover that others have thought of my thought before I got to it to express it. There is a Bill, I am told, by Representative Deavers on Eastern. I want to say that the proposal here by Representative Ebbesen is excellent. Everyone should be willing to support this Bill, this Amendment. It's unthinkable, that in this flood of Bills that have invaded this House, that we should ask for separate Bills to accomplish the same purpose. In the name of efficiency, let's combine them in one Bill; let's put these Amendments on. There's no reason whatever that we should have to lump all the Universities together with a common herd. Let's give each one of them a separate Board of Trustees and certainly on behalf of Northern, they are entitled to one, as Eastern is entitled to one, just as Edwardsville is entitled to one, and we mustn't combine...ah...mustn't combine our problem here by having separate Bills. Let's have the Amendments now, and get these Trustees established. So I urge each of you to give a green vote to Representative Ebbesen's excellent idea and amend this Bill in the manner suggested."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Ebbesen. This would set up a separate Board for Northern, as I understand it?"

Ebbesen: "That's correct."

Houlihan, J.: "What would be the relationship of this Board to the other



Boards or the other Universities?"

Ebbesen: "Well...ah...as you know...ah...Representative that we have in the entire University system, we have the Board of Regents which has...ah...33 Campuses. It has Illinois State, Sangamon State and Northern Illinois University and then you have the Board of Governors which has...ah...five and then we have the two Boards that the.. I mean the...yeah, two Campuses under the Trustees at Southern and then we, of course three campuses under the Trustees of the University of Illinois and all I'm saying is that...ah...I feel that perhaps this is an appropriate time to reaccess the entire posture of this system. Northern having its own separate Board of Trustees and then...ah...perhaps leaving the Regency with ...ah...Illinois State, Sangamon State and even perhaps encompassing the Edwardsville Campus. If they want a different Board maybe they should be in the Regency. This is just a off the cuff statement but definetly Northern Illinois University, I think, is at that point in time, it probably should have been done fifteen or twenty years ago but, should have its own Board of Trustees and therefore I would urge adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to be disrespectful but we're familiar with the issues, we know the concerns and there's much to be done today, may I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. two-thirds rather. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye', 25 'no' the motion carries. Representative Ebbesen to close."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that..ah..in the interest of time and effect that there are other opposes on this. I would just encourage a favorable Roll Call. Anyone who cares to make any comments, explain their vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'no's' have it. All in favor vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who



who wish? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that quite often on the Floor of this House, we've heard it said that let's put the Bill in the shape or the way the Sponsor wants it. I don't feel that that is the case at all. I don't feel that one person that offers a Bill has the absolute dictatorship type of right to see that it comes out in whatever shape he so desires, we're talking about Bills that could possibly become law and effect the entire State of Illinois. So I suggest to any of you that have vote of conscience whatsoever to support this Amendment, to try to make this a...a separate Board for Northern as well."

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

Dyer: "In explaining my 'no' vote very quickly, I just want to say, this would lead proliferation of Boards, this would crease...increase the administrative overhead for every student in Higher Education. I'm so happy to see more 'no' votes than 'yes' votes up there and I hope it will continue that way."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 55 'aye', 78 'no'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Ralph Dunn. Amends Senate Bill 16 on page 1 by deleting line 1 through 4 and inserting in lieu thereof, the following, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Just a minute...Permission has been granted for the photographer here to take some pictures. Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to offer Amendment #2 and urge its adoption. Amendment #2, I think, should be a very good Amendment for Senate Bill 16 because it places the University of Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville under the Board of Regents. As you all know, particularly if you're much interested in Higher Education. We have four Boards operating the...the Higher Boards of...the Higher Colleges in the State of Illinois, Southern Illinois University



The University of Illinois, the Board of Regents and the Board of Governors. These four Boards do a very fine job. Now I can understand the fact spoken by the Sponsor of Senate Bill 30...ah...Senate Bill 16. Perhaps they don't like being under Southern Illinois University at Carbondale but certainly they should have no objections of being a member of the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents now has three Universities, Illinois State University was in the enrollment of 19,375, Northern Illinois University was 24,812 and Sangamon State University about 3,300. Now S.U.I....S.I.U. at Edwardsville is not a large school. It has 13,000 enrollment but they get next to the smallest in the Board of Regents and I'd like to urge the adoption of this Amendment. It will save a lot of money and this is one thing we're interested in right now. If we create a new Board and have another Board...ah...for Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, it creates a gigantic expense upon the State of Illinois and I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr...Mr. Speaker...ah...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Calvo: "Mr. Dunn, due to the similarity of Amendment 2 and 4 and 3 and 5 and the similarity of all four of them, I wonder if you'd be willing to discuss the four as a package and take one vote for all four Amendments?"

Dunn: "No, I don't believe I would. If Amendment #2. I'll tell you what I'll do. Just adopt Amendment #2, then we'll skip 3, 4 and 5."

Calvo: "Well okay. Mr. Speaker then, if I might address myself to the Amendment. I certainly would oppose Amendment #2, for several reasons, but the biggest reason I think, is that the staff has contacted the Board of Regents to try to determine if they would want S.I.U. Edwardsville within their Board of Regency and they have responded absolutely not. They





do not want this responsibility and do not want to accept it. Now I think that's the finest argument I could make for the defeat of Amendment #2 and without reiterating my other remarks I feel that this has no relationship to the issue at hand. I've talked about that issue in the defeat of Amendment #1 and the fact that S.I.U. Edwardsville is unique in the State of Illinois as a four year University and due to that uniqueness is the reason that we're here and...ah...without reiterating those remarks I would ask the defeat of Amendment #2 so this Bill could be heard on its merits and be voted up or down."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentlemans moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 16. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', ...Representative Dunn to close."

Dunn: "Thank you sir...ah...Thank you Mr. Speaker. I...I'd just urge an 'aye' vote on this. It will save the state a lot of money, it will put the...ah...University at Edwardsville under a Board of Regents along with four... three other schools. There'd be four schools in that Board and I think this is the ideal place to have the University at Edwardsville. I'd urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I promise this will be the last time I rise on these Amendments unless mine gets here. Really this one is addressing itself much more to the issue that we haven't had. I, like Representative Cunningham, have an Amendment coming and...and probably we won't get to it but my Amendment would say, if I could it distributed in time, would say that we would abolish all of these Boards and have only one, so we wouldn't have all the fighting back and forth. So that we wouldn't have our colleges going through four and five and six respective Boards to get construction. I think that the duplication is absolutely wasteful, it's ridiculous. This is the best Amendment of any that were on our desks and I very much



think that we should consider to put this on the House...Senate Bill 16. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 51 'aye', 66 'no' and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Amendment."

Fred Selcke: "Ralph Dunn. Amend Senate Bill 16 page 1 by deleting lines 1 through 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you. Thank you Mr. Speaker. I had...I think I had a little more support on that last one if we'd had a chance to explain our votes and I'd appreciate it on this one because this is the last chance. If this...I...I want to table the other...next two Amendment so this is my last chance to save the taxpayers of the State of Illinois and do a service to Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville by putting them under the good hands of the Board of Governors of the State of Illinois and the Board of Governors already have five fine schools, it has Chicago State University, Eastern Illinois University, Northeastern Illinois University, Western Illinois University and Governors State University. Now if Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville could be under the Board of Governors they would be the second largest school in that system. I'm sure they would get good treatment. They...they would have a responsible place to hang their hat and I'd urge that the adoption of Amendment #3 and I'd ask...and I'd be willing to answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well Mr. Speaker, once again we have a case where the staff upon seeing this Amendment contacted the Board of Governors and they said absolutely we do not want the responsibility of...of having the S.I.U. at Edwardsville under our system. Now, I don't know how, you know, what better 'tertement'...testimony we can have than their own statement that they do not want to have the responsibility of S.I.U. Edwardsville added to their system and for that reason primar...for that reason perhaps in...in one degree I would urge your



defeat of this Amendment. For the other reason, that we do have a unique situation which I talked to you about in addressing myself to the first Amendment. I would urge your defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

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

I likewise would urge that this Amendment be defeated...ah... It has been put on with very little prior thought. The Board of Governors have not been consulted, they've not been given their approval to this Amendment and I think it would be highly irresponsible for us as Legislators to try to adopt something which has been given such short study and such short consideration and I would surely urge that as the previous two Amendments that you would likewise defeat this Amendment that this Bill can be considered to stand or fall upon its own merits. I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn to close."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd urge an 'aye' vote on this, this is a good Amendment it will save the state a lot of money. We heard the Governor say just a week ago that we're in a dire financial state and if we go and have a separate Board for S.I.U. at Edwardsville it will cost us untold amounts of money and I'd urge that we'd put them under the arm of the Board of Governors. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 16. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 46 'aye', 61 'no'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #4. Ralph Dunn. Amends Senate Bill 16 page 1 by deleting lines 1 through 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. In as much...in as much as Amendment #1 was lost, why Amendment #4 and 5 are not applicable and I ask that they be tabled."



Speaker Redmond: "Leave granted to table Amendments #4 and 5.

Leave granted. Tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #6. Deavers. Amends Senate Bill 16 page 1 by deleting lines 1 through 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to hear 6, 7 and 8 at the same time."

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

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #7. Amends Senate Bill 16 page 1 and so forth. Amendment #8. Amends Senate Bill 16 page 1 by deleting lines 1 through 4 and so forth."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. What Amendment 6, 7 and 8 does is the same thing that Joe Ebbesen asked for for Northern Illinois and why we're here. We have Illinois State University Western Illinois and Eastern Illinois and I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well Mr. Speaker I think the argument that I put forth to Amendment #1 is certainly applicable to these three Amendments. They all state different Universities and...ah.. and attempt to create their own Board of Trustees. None of these three Universities are anywhere near in the same circumstances as the University and as the Bill. I wouldn't say they're not germane. They're certainly not at all any, in any way the same type of issue. We have, as I mentioned here, a situation where we have two Universities under appointed Board of Trustees. None of these three are in that circumstance and for that reason and the reasons I expressed in my arguments as to Amendment #1. Although the ideas may be meritorious, I think they should have their own Legislation at the time that the Sponsor feels that that should come about and for that reason I do not feel they should be on this Bill and for the reasons stated before I feel these Amendments should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."



Cunningham: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Without being argumentative. Eastern Illinois University is an exceptional school. It has approximately 10,000 students, for almost a century it has been a proud fountain of learning in our area. It's just beyond the limits of the 54th District I do not want you to think that I'm being pushy by getting up here rather than the Representatives from that District. But it's a fact of which we're very proud in my home town of Sumner that has a population of 1,000 and a high school of 100, that the President of Eastern Illinois University, President Buzzard for a quarter of a century and we feel for because...on account of that a special interest in this fine school.. While its relationship with the Board of Governors has been harmonious and the Board of Governors has been kind. Yet there's just a little bit of chasing there. There is absolutely no reason in logic or education in sens... in any sense of fair play that you should give a separate Board of Trustees to lesser schools throughout the State and deny that same degree of fairness and equity to Eastern Illinois University. We musn't get into a pattern here of voting 'no'. I urge you to consider this Amendment on its special merit and find it in your heart to vote 'aye' for the Amendment for fairness, for better education throughout the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn to close....Representative Deavers to close. Pardon me. It's getting to be a habit."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I...I feel that Illinois State and Western and Eastern deserve the same special interests that S.I.U. at Edwardsville is trying to receive in their Bill and I think one special interest deserves another special interest and I move for the favorable adoption of Amendment 6, 7 and 8."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of these Amendments. The question is on the adoption. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative James Houlihan."



Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to vote 'no' on this Bill and I think the Gentleman has indicated why we should vote 'no' and that is that every University thinks that they're special, every University thinks that they're unique. In many cases they think they shouldn't even be under the guidance of the General Assembly in appropriating funds. I think that we ought to hold this Bill in fact and wait for Representative McGrew's Amendment which would finally bring some order to the University system. I think we ought not to have the proliferation of Boards, regencies and trustees and we ought to unify that system so that it can be brought under the control of the Legislature and be made a little bit more accountable"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr...Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my 'yes' vote by saying that I think in all three of these Universities shown in I...in Amendments 6, 7 and 8. Are just as much entitled or maybe even more so to have a separate board and would be S.I.U. at Edwardsville. Two of the two that are bigger than S.I.U at Edwardsville and of course we all have schools that are unique. I have a school that's unique in my District that will have it's own separate Board if Senate Bill 16 carries. I'd urge that this Board also have right, the right to have separate Boards. I'd urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment. On these Amendments. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Coffey."

Coffey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too rise in support of this Bill, or this Amendment to Senate Bill 16. Eastern Illinois University is...is in my home town, I'm proud of Eastern Illinois University and for...ah...the century that it's been there and for everything that it has stood for, they've requested before to have their own separate Board. I've been told by some of the different individuals supporting the...this Bill that it's cheaper to have their own Board to...ah...for the Edwardsville Campus and if this is true then it may well be that it would be less expensive to have an

Individual Board for each University and on those merit I would  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY



like to ask support of this Amendment so Eastern Illinois University as well as the other two Campuses might have their own boards also."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'yes' vote...ah...I would just like to point out to the Members of this House. Just briefly a little bit of a history. You know, making changes and proposals like this is really not anything new and...ah...perhaps this Amendment that is suppose to be, being distributed right not will address itself to that problem but just as recent as 1964, when we had the first master plan of the Board of Higher Education and they recommended at that time that the State acquire Chicago Teachers and this campus be operated...ah...by the Teachers College Board and that the name of the Teachers College Board be changed at that time to the Governors of State Colleges and Universities and as recent as 1966 phase II of that master plan recommended that the Board of Regents be created...ah...which is now in existence to operate Northern and Illinois State and then in 69 they added to that, Sangamon State and as recent as 1970, the University of Illinois opened its new Medical Campuses in Rockford and Peoria...ah...while Southern has it's new Medical Campus right here in Springfield and what I'm really saying is that when people say that these, this...ah...Board of Trustees situation is nothing new, well you propose changes, you see inadequacies...ah...and so forth, so...ah...I would just make these expressions in terms of my 'aye' vote and also would encourage that we take a very close look at Representative McGrew's Amendment that's forthcoming."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederich."

Frederich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Now that we have a full four year University in every section of the state, I think the time has probably come to divide this state into sections, each with its own state university which elects its own Board from the people in that area. I think that would cause the Universities to have a flavor of the area that, in which it operates, I think it

would make those people responsible to the people in the area, but in the



meantime if we're going to appoint them we just as well appoint them all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Members of the General Assembly for seeing the defect in each one of these Amendment. I hope they'll remember that with all due respect to the very charming Sponsor, the basic Bill is bad, because it would fragment our...our government in our Higher Education system even more than it is now and I think you should know that the new executive director of the Board of Higher Education, Mr. James Ferman has already directed that the summer, this summer be spent by a task force of his...ah...Board and of his staff in studying this whole problem of Governments of Higher Universities in Illinois. I think when we come back in the Fall there will be a practical suggestion from this Board that we can consider and until that study is finished I would urge that you continue to vote 'no' on all these Amendments and finally the Bill itself."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd like to ask a couple of questions that...you know there's quite a bit of philosophy running around here that there ought to be a little pork for all the districts and the 44th district really hasn't had a pork, any pork this year and so we'd like to have a little parity and make it fair and the whole thing. I sit here and I vote for a bridge that goes across the Peoria River..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 45 'aye', 87 'no'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments? Might as well advise the Membership of our plans. We lost ground yesterday instead of gaining ground, we added three pages to the Calendar and I don't know how many Bills to the...to the Calendar. Today we will not break for lunch. There's been a request by the Republicans to have a break, I believe it's from 5 to 7 tonight for the purpose of some nefarious business and then we will

come back after that, unless we make some better progress it

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES





looks like we're going to have to be here Saturday and Sunday so I think we have to make plans for that. Any further Amendments? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, breaking from 5 to 7 is less nefarious than breaking for three weeks so that we can elect a Mayor in Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, but you didn't do it."

Walsh: "We didn't have to."

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe....maybe....maybe your nefarious business will be more successful. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments? Third Reading. I've been advised by Thomas here that it's 6 to 8 rather than 5 to 7. I thought you were early birds but evidently you weren't. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker for purposes of an announcement. Seated in the Gallery behind the Speakers podium is the family of Senator Sam Romano from Chicago, his wife Lena, his daughter Diane and his and...ah...four of his grand-daughters. Would they stand and take a bow please?"

Speaker Redmond: "37."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 37...."

Speaker Redmond: "Take that out of the record. The Sponsor is not on the Floor. 98."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 98..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin....Representative Hart."

Fred Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #....damn it....Committee Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 98, page 2, by deleting and so forth."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to table Committee Amendment #1 and 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to table Committee Amendments #1 and 2? Leave granted. Hearing no objection. Any further Amendments?"



Fred Selcke: "Amendment #3. McPartlin. Amend Senate Bill 98 page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Ah...Senate Amendment #3 is almost the same as the Amendment I just tabled, it removes the Senate Amendment regarding the mechanics of numbering precincts and leaves that duty up to the County Clerk and I would ask that we adopt Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 98."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the Amendment...Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "Ah...If I remember right, Amendment #1 put a...three hundred...or...three million population or a three hundred thousand population figure on this Bill so it applied to...ah... Lake and DuPage Counties. Is that correct?"

McPartlin: "That's correct and Amendment #4 will do that same thing."

Kempiners: "Okay then, what was Amendment #2?"

McPartlin: "I'm on...Amendment #2 was the mechanics of it, as far as the County Board...ah...by deleting County Board and inserting in lieu thereof, Election Authority."

Kempiners: "Election Authority, okay and then Amendment #3 is making the term County Clerk and then Amendment #4 will put on the three hundred thousand minimum population so what we're doing is talking about the County Clerk in Lake and DuPage, is that correct?"

McPartlin: "That is...that is correct."

Kempiners: "Okay, as...ah...As the Speaker well knows in DuPage County they have an Election Commission. Now the County Clerk is a member of that Election Commission. So was that your intent?"

McPartlin: "Ah...Yes it is."

Kempiners: "To bypass the Election Commission?"

McPartlin: "It states the Election Authority."

Kempiners: "I thought that was the Amendment you tabled in favor of Amendment #3?"

McPartlin: "This...Well this is in #3 and it's correcting the language, the language was wrong as far as the Reference Bureau was concerned."



concerned. So I had..."

Kempiners: "Oh. So it's just a technical correction and...okay."

McPartlin: "It's the same thing...right."

Kempiners: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 98. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #4. McPartlin: "Amend Senate Bill 98 on page 2, line 14 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "As I said before, Amendment #4...ah...adds a three hundred thousand or more to the Bill whic...ah...was agreed in Committee and it's got corrective language in it and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 98."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 98. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. 241. Hold it, the Sponsor is not present. 379."

Fred Selcke: "Ah...Senate Bill 379. McPartlin."

Speaker Redmond: "McPartlin 379? Out? Take it out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. 443."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 443..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich. Read the Amendment. Representative Terzich. 443. Representative Terzich...ah...What's your memory on that, did that go to Third? That was moved to Third, the Calendar's in error. Hard as it seems to believe. 468. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, while I was temporarily absent from the Floor this morning I understand that Senate Bill 550, 551 and 552 were removed and placed on Third Reading...."

Speaker Redmond: "That's right."

Taylor: "I would like to ...I would like leave of this House to return those Bills back to Second Reading."



Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? 550, 551, 552 return to the Order of Second Reading. 468."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 468. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for the Board of Trustees, University of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. Four Committee Amendments. Committee Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 468 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Committee Amendment #1 has been replaced by Committee Am...or by ...ah...Amendment #9. I move to table Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to table Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 468. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled."

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2. Amends Senate Bill 468 page 1, line 12 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Amendment adds five hundred seventy one thousand, one hundred and eighteen dollars to the appropriation for wage inequities and wage differentials and I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 468. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #3. Amend Senate Bill 468 on page 7 by deleting line 32 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone. Representative Madigan will you..."

Stone: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. House Amendment #...Committee Amendment #3 was offered by Representative...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan I can't see Representative Stone, will you please take a seat?"

Stone: "Ah...was offered in Committee by Representative Catania. It is the Bill that or the Amendment that provides that...ah...no funds appropriated in this ...ah... appropriation shall be expended



in violation of the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission. I think the...the Amendment is absolutely unnecessary, it's sort of assinine, however, the House has been adopting them so I have no serious objection other than that to the Amendment so I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 468. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #4. Amends Senate Bill 468 page 2 by inserting immediately after line 4 the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Amendment was offered by Representative Keller. It adds seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars to the appropriation of the University of Illinois, one of the members of the Committee asked the President of the University if...ah...he got this money would he have room for a hundred additional students. The President stated 'no'. the Amendment was adopted but I see no reason to add it on here in as much as...ah...the University could not spend it. So I move to table Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #4. Does he have leave? Amendment #4 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #5. Hirschfeld. Amends Senate Bill 468 on page 4 by inserting between lines 7 and 8 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment #5. Offered by Representative Hirschfeld...ah...adds fifteen hundred and sixty-six dollars and seventy cents...ah...from, to the University of Illinois for the expenses of an Illinois Soccer Club. I think there's no great demand for a Soccer Club so I move to table Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #5. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is tabled. Amendment #6."



Fred Selcke: "Amendment #6. Hirschfeld. Amends Senate Bill 468 on page 7 and so forth."

Stone: "This Amendment appropriates further money to the University for the, for an Illinois Varsity Soccer Program and I move to table this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #6. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #6 is tabled."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #7. Grotberg. Amend Senate Bill 468 as amended on page 7 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. ...Mr....Mr. Speaker. This is the Amendment offered by Representative Grotberg yesterday to...ah...to the Regency...ah... appropriation Bill. The Chair held that it was not germane and it's exactly the same Amendment word for word and I would like the same ruling on this Amendment that we had yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you...thank you Mr. Speaker. In response to the remarks of the Gentleman from Moultrie...ah...The germaneness question was not why it was ruled out...ah...Representative Stone. It was ruled out because the lines didn't match. Although there was reference to the germaneness. I agree with you on that. I would like a complete new ruling on it myself Mr. Speaker."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman is mistaken. It was ruled not germane. Then the question of...of whether or not it was a proper Amendment because of the lines was brought up. The Speaker ruled that it was not germane. He later ruled that he had ruled that it was not germane. We went on to the next Amendment and I ask for the Chair to rule that it is not germane as the Chair did yesterday.....Mr. Speaker, this is an appropriation Bill, the Amendment has absolutely nothing to do with an appropriation."

Grotberg: "Well Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "We are studying."



O'Brien: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1290."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1290. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1298."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1298. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in Relation to State Finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment #1. J.M. Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 1298 as amended on page 2, line 31 by deleting the words 'to be comparable to' and insert in lieu thereof 'so as to not to exceed.'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a merely a technical amendment which would allow the Department of Finance to issue regulations which might be a little more stringent than the Federal guidelines. I talked to Representative McPartlin and the Auditor General. There is general agreement on this amendment, I know of no opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the adoption of amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1298. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1371."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1371. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand we do have an amendment."



Grotberg: "Yeah, we've put on several Amendments like this. Again we offered exhibit a, b, c and d yesterday from all over the Floor from Representative Younge, from Representative Catania, Amendments that have been adopted. So, we're not setting a president."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I believe, if I'm correct ...ah...perhaps you can stand to correct me. But this same Amendment was offered yesterday on the Board of Regents with the same language in it and the Speaker, the temporary Speaker who was in the Chair at that time ruled on the germaneness of it as it related to that Appropriation Bill and he ruled that it was not germane."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we ought to take this out of the record. The Parliamentarian says that it appears that right at the present time he can't distinguish what's right and what's wrong, so it would seem to me that we should take it out of the record and the Sponsor should come up and discuss it with the Parliamentarian. I don't, it's kind of an off the cuff thing but...ah...that's what he tells me and I think the proper procedure is to make sure that it's in a satisfactory form. Representative Bradley. And it doesn't, really doesn't have that much to do with Amendment 7, the other Amendments do. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think under...ah...Rule 26 (f), I think that was the...ah...what they were ruling on yesterday and (f) simply says, 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriation.' and this Amendment simply does not pertain with any Appropriation at all and that's why the germaneness question was...ah...raised yesterday and the ruling of the Chair at that time was that the Amendment was not germane because it does not deal with an Appropriation. I'd just call that to the attention of the Parliamentarian."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, but that isn't the main problem. The problem





the Parliamentarian has raised is in connection with some of the other Amendments too. So, if we...if we would rule on this and ultimately pass the Bill and we'd find out it was in error I think we'd be very sorry. Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I would still like a ruling on this one. I'm I am aware of the fact that Amendment #3, which is Representative Catania's Amendment may not be in order but then that Amendment can, we could bring us back to Second and ask to have that Amendment tabled if it were not in order. I would prefer to proceed now if we could."

Speaker Redmond: "Well in as much as the subject matter is so important and we have sent for the printed Bill. The Parliamentarian has raised some serious questions that..."

Stone: "Can we get back to this later today?"

Speaker Redmond: "We will get back to it...We'll return to it. It may be some technical imperfections here that, not only on this Amendment but on other...Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Representative Stone. The... The urgency of this type of Legislative intent on the language... putting language in a Bill like this..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's out of the record now Mr. Grotberg. Next Bill 484. Take that one out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Representative Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise?"

Cunningham: "In the normal course of events the next Bill would be 488 and I have an Amendment on 488. It's in compliance or an attempt to meet the direction of the Governor in regard to the expenditures for the military and naval forces of the State of Illinois. I spoke to the Sponsor of 488 about calling it back from Third Reading to Second that the Amendment might be considered. I'm not sure that his reply was in the affirmative..."

Speaker Redmond: "What order of business is 488 on?"

Cunningham: "It is now on Third Reading but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well the Order of business is House Bills Second Reading."

Cunningham: "But Mr. Speaker, it would be the next up if we were going to call it back for Second..."



Speaker Redmond: Well...It's not on Second it's on Third...You'll have to wait...According to Representative Walsh you'll have to wait until..."

Cunningham: "Must I wait till we get....I will abide by your wishes."

Speaker Redmond: "658. Representative Beaupre, 658."

Fred Selcke: "Give me that Bill...ah...Senate Bill 658. A Bill for an Act to make an Appropriation to the Board of Trustees of the Judges Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amend Senate Bill 658 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 658. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted.

Any further Amendments? Representative Lechowicz. Representative

Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry Mr Speaker. Did the Sponsor indicate that that was a Committee Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah. Committee Amendment."

Lechowicz: "What did it do? That's news to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 658 is not a Committee Amendment and

I think we should have some explanation on it. It was not offered as a Committee Amendment and the Amendment as far as

I'm concerned, I'm going to oppose it as I opposed it in Committee. I think that we should get it out on the table

here and...ah...I...I will oppose it here. I would suggest

to the Sponsor of the Bill and this is merely a suggestion, that he would oppose this Amendment and have some discussion

on it so we'll know what it's involving. It is not a

Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It was my understanding that it was a Committee Amendment and if that is



not the case, I can assure you as the Sponsor of the Bill that I am indeed opposed to the Amendment and therefore I would move to reconsider Amendment #1 having voted on the prevailing side."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 658 was adopted. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker may...Mr. Speaker perhaps I'm not understanding exactly what a Committee Amendment is. It's my understanding that a Committee Amendment is one that was offered and adopted in Committee which this Amendment was. Now I...I don't want to get hung up on the semantics of what is and is not a Committee Amendment and I don't even know whether it is or is not a Committee Amendment is even important but...ah...just for the sake of clarification this Amendment was offered and adopted in Committee and I would therefore deem it for that reason, a Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "I agree with you. I would deem it that also. Representative Barnes. The Gentleman has moved to reconsider however. Representative Barnes. The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 658 was adopted. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Well is the Sponsor of the Amendment on the Floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs. The answer is no."

Ryan: "Well I would request a Roll Call vote on this Mr. Chairman... or Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you...Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. What...What I was saying Representative Ryan to Minority Members...Minority Spokesman on the Committee is in concert I think with what you're saying. The adoption of the Amendment had...went through sort of in the uproar here without a full explanation of it. I think it should be explained by the Sponsor of the Amendment. It was not an Amendment that was offered....it was offered by an individual Member of a Committee as you well know, it's highly controversial and I think that it should have a full hearing here prior to any adoption thereof."



Speaker Redmond: "The vote to reconsider carries. Now if the Bill is in the pre..in the form that it was in before. Now we will go to Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 648. Is Representative Downs here? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, you had ruled earlier that on a voice vote the only one who can make a motion to reconsider of an Amendment is the Sponsor of that Amendment because he's the only one that you can identify as having voted for it."

Speaker Redmond: "I identified Representative Beaupre because he moved the adoption of it so in this particular case I could identify him. It seems to me that the only fair way is to leave this Bill in the shape that it was in before the Amendment was considered and that is the ruling of the Chair. Now we're on consideration of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 658. Is the spons.....the Sponsor of the Amendment on the Floor? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well I'm not the Sponsor Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you a Member of the Committee."

Ryan: "I certainly am...I'm the minority spokesman."

Speaker Redmond: "I would believe that you probably could then move for the adoption if you wish."

Ryan: "I would like to have somebody tell me exactly what this Amendment does. Is this the 6 per cent Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Amendment."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1. Amend Senate Bill 658 on page 1, line 11 by striking five million, two hundred thousand dollars and inserting in lieu thereof, four million eight hundred and eighty eight thousand dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn. For what purpose do you rise?"

Dunn: "Mr. Chairman, I did...I guess I missed out on a little something. But Representative Downs offered this Amendment in Committee and it was adopted in Committee. I don't know why it isn't a Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I have ruled that it is a Committee Amendment but it has to be adopted on the Floor in order to be affixed to the Bill."

Dunn: "Right."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs is now on the Floor. You decide to discuss Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 658. I guess we better take this one out of the record until we know what we're doing with it. Rep...Representative Downs. Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. We'll take that one out of the record. Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I'm the Sponsor of the Bill and I would just as soon not take it out of the record. Now Mr. Downs is here if he wants to speak to his Amendment fine but if he doesn't want to speak to it, let's move the Bill to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, 658."

Downs: "Move to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman, the Sponsor of the Amendment, as I understand it does not desire to pursue the Amendment, is that correct? Are there any further Amendments? Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "No further Amendments, Third Reading. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well Mr. Speaker, you've ruled that a Committee Amendment. I'm a Member of that Committee and I...and I...I don't know how he can withdraw that Amendment now or not Sponsor it."

Speaker Redmond: "He moved to withdraw..."

Ryan: "If that's the case, then I'll Sponsor the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "He's moved to withdraw the Amendment...Third Reading."

Ryan: "We've already ruled it a Committee Amendment. Mr. Speaker I would respectfully request you take this out of the record until we get this straightened out."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Third Reading now. 935...."

Ryan: "Well Mr. Speaker, you're not being consistent...."

Speaker Redmond: "1018. ...Representative..."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 10..."

Ryan: "You're unreal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker, for point of inquiry. The Amendment which we just discussed was an Amendment which was..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is this on 1018?"

Peters: "Just a ...this is just an inquiry concerning the procedure. Now that Amendment was approved by the House Appropriations II Committee. Now for the Sponsor in Committee after receiving Committee approval to decide on the Floor not to call it, it's certainly a denial of the Committee process. Now Members of that Committee ended up voting on the Bill and they have a right... to have that Bill heard here. If they want to defeat it...that ...that's another question but that Amendment ought to be heard."

Speaker Redmond: "1018."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill..."

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

Keller: "Well Mr. Speaker...ah...We...We heard the Amendment that they're talking about in the Appropriations Committee. Now whether we agree with the Amendment or not with the Amendment. Representative Ryan at the time had a very similar Amendment prepared in the Committee and he did not present it here on Second Reading because of the fact that this Amendment was adopted in...in Committee and thinking this Amendment would be adopted on the Floor and I think that we're doing him an injustice because he would have had his Amendment prepared and put it up here on Second Reading to try to...try to adopt it. I mean whether we're for or against the Amendment's not the thing. But I think that the Sponsor of the Bill should allow him at least the courtesy to...to present his Amendment now."

Speaker Redmond: "The Sponsor declined. We're on 1018."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1018. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 3 of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPar...Representative McPartlin."

Fred Selcke: "One Committee Amendment. Amend..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin...who's that. Representative Telcser, for what purpose do you rise?"



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I want to make a Parliamentary Inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Telcser: "If a Committee adopts an Amendment, is that a Committee Amendment or is it not?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well I've ruled that it's identified as a Committee Amendment."

Telcser: "Then how does a Member from that side of the aisle, who now wants to crawl away from his Amendment have the right to deny this House the privilege of voting that Amendment up or down."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think that that was in Roberts Rules of Order that that's germane..."

Telcser: "You just said that it was a Committee Amendment. Why can't the House vote on it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs. It's on Third Reading right now."

Telcser: "If he made a deal, if that Member made a deal for himself that's up to him..."

Speaker Redmond: "You're out of order to talk like that Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "No, I'm asking you a question. Answer it."

Speaker Redmond: "It's not a deal, it's a shuffle. Is the Sponsor of 1018 on the Floor? 1024. Representative McPartlin. 1057. Representative Meyers on the Floor? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker, just so that I understand now what we're going to...what we're...what the ruling is. If a Committee Amendment is offered and the Sponsor of that Amendment in Committee decides not to call it, then according to your ruling he has that right not to call it."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's been the procedure. Representative Meyers here? Representative Meyers. Take that out of the record. For what purpose does Representative Ryan arise?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal the Ruling of the Chair, regarding Senate Bill 658."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on the next order, the next Bill. I think you're too late on that Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege on Senate 658..."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your point of personal privilege?"



Ryan: "My point is as is pointed out by Representative Keller. I've had Amendments drawn for all of these Bills. I certainly would have offered my Amendment had I known this was not...That you were going to take this kind of action. Now your ram rod tactics are certainly being very unfair, Mr. Speaker and I am personally opposed to the way you're conducting yourself in the Chair. I think it's atrocious..."

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

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker...ah...I...I rise to try to do two things, first to...ah...perhaps reduce the strong feeling because there's a very great sense here at the moment of injustice on a very important matter...ah...we are trying ...ah... with all honest effort to respond to the Governors requests to bring back a reduction of 6 per cent. With a total non-partisan hope to accomplish that purpose and working within the Committee structure just as diligently as possible are the Members are trying to put forth this purpose. Now it seems to me to be somewhat less than honorable for anybody on this House Floor to have proposed to put forward an Amendment as the Committee Amendment in lieu of one offered by our Minority Spokesman in the same Committee and then..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close they're not germane."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker I'm trying to make a very important a point as I can here, this is...ah...I don't, I don't want to use language that surges up in me about this kind of action on the part of the Members of that Committee who are accomplishing this purpose with your per...with your assistance sir. This is not right. We want to help reduce the...ah...6 per cent factor..."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. Every Member of the General Assembly realizes that Committees don't present Bills and Committees don't present Amendments. They entrust Members of the Committee to present the Amendments and if the Members of the Committee feel that the Committee has been served they can table the Amendments. We can't have a Committee Meeting on every Amendment that's been presented on

Committee, on Committee Bills. It's insanity. The Speakers ruled right  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY





and I think your...your point is well taken, we should move to Senate Bill 1057, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. Representative Ryan, again."

Ryan: "Well Mr. Speaker, under Rule 71, I would now appeal the ruling of the Chair concerning Senate Bill 658. Rule 71. I am joined by 6 Members..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Point of order. We're not on that Bill. We have moved to another order of business. We're on Senate Bill 1057 and I don't think Representative Ryans motion is timely."

Speaker Redmond: "You are correct. The Order of Business is Senate Bills, Third Reading. On Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 433...Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well Mr. Speaker, under Rule 71, it doesn't matter what...it does...we have not changed the order of business. We're on the same order of business and my appeal is correct and I persist in my appeal to the Chair. I request a vote."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe that when we went to the, to the next Bill that it was not timely and that was my ruling. Senate Bills, Third Reading. 433. It appears in error...I am... I am advised. Do we have leave to return 433 which in error appears on for...to the order of Second Reading. Leave granted. 433 is on the order of Second Reading. Representative Washburn. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On your reply to Representative Ryan that...ah...concerning the same order of business. We're on the Second Reading of Senate Bills he made his request for an appealing of the Chair. We're still on Senate Bills Second Reading at this time and...ah...I think that...ah...Representative Ryan was completely in order. I think that we have to have the maj...the minority side of this aisle even though we're 76 in numbers Mr. Speaker. I think that we certainly should be recognized and that you should give us a roll in this..in our attempt to...ah...have a diligent...ah...orally Legislative for the remaining few days of this Legislative Session. Something you haven't given

us for the last month or so and I would suggest Mr. Speaker that  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY



perhaps you could pay a little more attention and a little more respect to the Members of the Republican party in this Legislature."

Speaker Redmond: "I've called for Senate Bill 433 that's on Third Reading on the Calendar in error. I presume the only procedural way we can accept the error and move it back to the order of Second Reading. Any objections to moving it back to Second Reading so that it can be where it belongs? Hearing no objection... That's the Attorney Generals Appropriation. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "What's...Mr. Speaker, what was the error? We didn't understand what the error was."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether it was the Clerk or the printer or who it was. But it shows to be on Third Reading and it should in fact be on Second Reading. 433. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker the Senate Bill 433 is the Department of Revenue annual appropriation...ah..it is in error, it was on Second Reading yesterday. We didn't move it to Third. But if the...ah...if the Membership objects on the other side, I'd be more than happy to keep it on Third Reading and move it out as it came from the Senate. We amended it...ah...to accomodate what our analysis said should be done. We also incorporated a 6 per cent cut as we seemed fit. But if you want to move it out in its amended version from the Senate, it's okay with me."

Speaker Redmond: "We're waiting on the Minority Leader. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Are we on Senate Bill 433?"

Speaker Redmond: "We went to the order of Senate Bills Third Reading and on there appears Senate Bill 433. It should not be on Third Reading, it should be on Second Reading."

Washburn: "Well, it's an error in printing you mean on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "In the printing or the Clerk or the Speaker or someone."

Washburn: "That's all I ask. We...I didn't understand what the error was so it's just on the wrong list on the Calendar, a printer's error. Is that correct?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Selcke, the Clerk of long standing will explain it."

Fred Selcke: "On House Bills. On Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 443, which should be on Third Reading and on the Order of Third Reading appears Senate Bill 433 which actually should be on Second Reading. So the, the printer in his preparation of the..printing the Calendar apparently made the transposition. He put 443 on Second instead of Third and 433 on Third instead of Second. Any clearer?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection to showing it on Second Reading rather than on Third Reading. No objections. It will show on Senate Bills.."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #...House Bill 433. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Revenue. Senate Bill. Second Reading of the Bill One Committee Amendment. Committee Amendment #1 amends Senate Bill 433 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Fred Selcke: "Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well I believe that there are more than one Committee Amendments."

Fred Selcke: "Yeah, there's a ton of them Ted, I just read the first one."

Lechowicz: "Amendment #1 increases the income tax refund from a hundred and twenty-five million to a hundred and thirty-four million. This was based upon their 1975 Acts of appropriation and their 75 Supplemental Appropriation. We adopted this Amendment in Committee upon the payouts where we've experienced in 1975. I move for adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 433. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted."

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2 amends Senate Bill 433 as amended on page 6 line 20 and so forth."

Lechowicz: Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is really a technical correction. It's as amended to the reference on page 6 to the Senior Citizens and disabled persons property



tax relief act. It is a technical Amendment and in order to avoid any confusion as to the Act being referenced, I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2, to Senate Bill 433. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Selcke: "Committee Amendment #3 amends Senate Bill 433 on page 2, line 35 and so forth."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Committee Amendment #3, makes an adjustment of two hundred forty-six thousand, nine hundred dollars in the tax processing division, is the phase-in weight for the employees that has been requested by the department, and I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 433. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Selcke: "Committee Amendment #4 amends Senate Bill 433 on page 1, line 13, and so forth."

Lechowicz: "Committee Amendment #4, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House is a six percent reduction, as adjusted with the Department and I move for the adoption."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 433. All those in favor say 'aye', failed, opposed say 'nay', the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Selcke: "Committee Amendment #5 amends Senate Bill 433, page 7 and so forth."

Bradley: "One moment please. What's the...For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, arise Sir?"

Houlihan: "Just a...inquiry of the Sponsor of the Amendment that was adopted."

Bradley: "On Amendment #4?"

Houlihan: "Right, just an inquiry. I know the Amendment's been adopted, I just have an inquiry."



Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Houlihan: "Ah...Ted, with this amended, if the proposed legislation was which was introduced by Senator Partee and State Representative Shea was adopted, would that be six percent of the total budget with the reduction, or would that six percent not apply to this particular Bill, since it's already been reduced?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to reply."

Lechowicz: "All the Governor has to do is line item veto this Amendment. Disregard. Wait a minute, let me see."

Houlihan: "I don't think that's possible."

Lechowicz: "What you do is come in with a Deficiency Appropriation to correct the situation. I think thee...I'm sorry, now that you raise the question, I think the term is may instead of shall, and that is the discretion between the Director and the Governor. The key difference is may instead of shall."

Bradley: "Back to Amendment #5, and the Amendment's been read. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz on Amendment #5."

Lechowicz: "I believe that's the FEPC Amendment, I'm not sure."

Bradley: "Did you move for the adoption of the Amendment?"

Lechowicz: "No, wait, I want the Clerk to read it."

Bradley: "Read Amendment #5."

Lechowicz: "Is that the FEPC Amendment?"

O'Brien: "Yes, it is."

Lechowicz: "Move the adoption."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of ah...Committee Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 433. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Committee Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Skinner. Amend Senate Bill 433 on page 6, by inserting between line 8 and 9, the following, Section 3A and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner on Amendment #6."

Skinner: "Of all the department's in the state, this department certainly deserves this Amendment. This Amendment prohibits the department from using any of its funds for mass mailings on behalf of the Governor."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, on Amendment #6."



Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I believe we ruled on this Amendment in Committee. We ruled on a...a similar Bill on the Floor yesterday that the Amendment is not germane to the Bill. It's a matter of substance to an Appropriation Bill. The Speaker ruled yesterday that it was not germane."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this tells how the money shall and shall not be spent. It is definitely directed at the budget, and I would suggest that it is germane, in this department, if in no other."

Bradley: "The Chair ruled that it is not germane, and you well know that in Rule 26 of the House, appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriation, and therefore this Amendment is not germane to Senate Bill 433."

Skinner: "Is this Amendment any less germane than Representative Younge's Amendment?"

Bradley: "The Chair has ruled on this Amendment. Fur...further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Bradley: "Third Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 935. Representative Marovitz on the Floor? Senate Bill 992. Dan Houlihan. Take it out of the Record. Senate Bill 10...1024, Representative McPartlin. Take it out of the Record. Senate Bill 105...sss...to hold. We'll go to House Bills, Second Reading. On the order of House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 1745. Representative Choate. That's Second Reading. Want to read this Bill? We're on House Bills, Second Reading, read the House Bill, a second..."

O'Brien: "House Bill 1745, Choate. A Bill for an Act making an Appropriation to the State Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Bradley: "Any Amendment's from the Floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Bradley: "Third Reading. Senate...House Bill on Second Reading, appears 1298. Read the Bill a second time."

O'Brien: "House Bill ..."

Bradley: "Oh, pardon me. 1...2989. Hanahan."



O'Brien: "House Bill 2989, Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Eleven Committee Amendments. Amendments 3, 5, and 12 were tabled in the Committee. Amendment #1, amends House Bill 2989 on page 15, line 27 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, on Amendment #1."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Most of these Amendments are Committee Amendments and I defer the Committee Amendments to allow me to speak on any of them I may have ah...ah...a statement to make on, but these Amendments truly should be handled by Representative Barnes, who is the Vice-Chairman of Appropriation's Committee."

Bradley: "Representative Barnes, on Amendment #1."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Committee Amendment #1, wait a minute, let me get it together here, so I'll have the exact one."

Hanahan: "That increases the appropriation for the catagorical grant program."

Barnes: "Okay. Committee Amendment #1 increases the appropriation for the various catagorical grant programs and should have sufficient funds available to reimburse school districts for eligible programs. It implements their recommendations, and I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1. The amount of the...the amount of the Amendment, involved in the Amendment is eighteen million, one hundred forty-five thousand. It is for various catagory grants for reimbursement for building, private tuition, dependent and foster children, transportation, education, free lunch and breakfast, driver's education, and adult education Americanization. I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 2989. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Amends House Bill 2989 on page 2, line 9 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, on Amendment #2."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...Committee Amendment #2 makes a total reduction of two hundred eighty-five thousand, two hundred and seventy-four



dollars. It reduces ah...fifty-thousand dollars...fifty-thousand, one hundred dollars line item for messenger clerks and one clerk typist. It reduces a hundred forty-two thousand for changes in office designs, and eliminates rent for food service training cafeterias. It reduces ninety-three thousand, one hundred forty-six for... ah...one clerk typist and five educational specialist in the bilingual program. I would move for the, and it also deletes language which allows the Office of Education to spend, to expend federal dollars which is not been appropriated. I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #2, to 2989."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment #2, to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'nay', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Amendment #3 has been tabled, I understand. Alright, Amendment #4."

O'Brien: "Amendment #4 amends House Bill 2989 and so forth."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #4 reduces the appropriation of federal funds for operation Fiscal '76 to a level appropriated in Fiscal '75. I would move for the adoption of the Committee Amendment #4 to 2989."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment #4, to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Amendment #5 has been tabled. Amendment #6."

O'Brien: "Amendment #6 amends House Bill 2989 as amended on page 1, line 14 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, on Amendment #6."

Hanahan: "I haven't...I haven't got a copy of it, I have to be very frank. I got to wait for Jim Jepsen to get back here."

Bradley: "He's hurrying back right now."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a five percent or fifty dollar cost of living increase for the employees of the Office of Education. As most members are aware of, last year when we did pass the cost-of-living, the hundred dollar cost-of-living, it did not affect the Office of Education employees. They did receive an increase, but it was at five percent, and was not the hundred dollar





cost-of-living. This Amendment would allow those at the...ah... lowest income in the Office of Education, the clerks and the other employees at the low income bracket to receive a fifty dollar a month cost-of-living increase. The total increase in the budget will be five hundred and sixty-three thousand, eight hundred and seventy-five dollars, and I move for its adoption."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment #6 to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

O'Brien: "Amendment #7 amends House Bill 2989 on page 22, line 30, and after line 23 the following: Section 4 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, on Amendment #7."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Committee Amendment #7 is an allocation to the Office of Education for the expansion of the residential school program to expand it to include the whole county of Cook, plus the expansion of a Truancy Prevention Program to include a research project for downstate Illinois. The total cost of this Amendment is two million dollars. I move the adoption of Amendment #...Committee Amendment #7."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Committee Amendment #7 to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment."

O'Brien: "Amendment #8 amends House Bill 2989 on page 22, line 30 between lines 12 and 13, and so forth."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Amendment #8 simply ah...transfers the expenditures of ten million, six hundred sixty-thousand dollars from the General Revenue Fund and takes it out of the bonds for school construction funds. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #8."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Committee Amendment #8 to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendment."

O'Brien: "Amendment #9 amends House Bill 2989 as amended on page 16 by deleting line 5 and inserting in lieu thereof the following..."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook Mr. Barnes on Amendment #9."



Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I'm not really sure who's Amendment this is. I think it was Representative..."

Bradley: "Representative Peters."

Barnes: "On the gifted children. Was that yours Peters?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, on Amendment #9."

Peters: "Mr. Chairman, this...ah...Amendment adds two hundred fifty thousand dollars to the Gifted Children's Program for the state. Is that the one?"

Barnes: "A million dollars."

Peters: "Well, yes, but it's seven fifty and it increases by two fifty doesn't it. It increases by two hundred fifty-thousand dollars the grant for the Gifted Childrens Program."

Bradley: "You're moving the adoption of the Amendment #9 to House Bill 2989? All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Further Amendments."

O'Brien: "Amendment #10 amends House Bill 2989 on page 22, by inserting between lines 17 and 18 the following: Section 2A and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, on Amendment #10."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #10 adds the sum of one million dollars which implements Senate Bill 87 which has passed out of both Houses for the School Library Immediate Service Act. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #10 to House Bill 2989."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #10 to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Further Amendments."

O'Brien: "Amendment #11 amends House Bill 2989 on page 22, by deleting line 33 and inserting in lieu thereof the following: Section 6 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook Mr. Barnes on Amendment #11."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #11 is the FEPC Amendment. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #11 to House Bill 2989."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #11 to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Further Amendments."



O'Brien: "Amendment #12 was tabled in Committee. Floor Amendment #13, Hanahan. Amends House Bill 2989 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Would the Clerk read that Amendment further?"

O'Brien: "In Section 1 educational planning and management from Title V part c, elementary and secondary education funds by changing from ...."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "This is the agreed Amendment that will allow the additional federal money to be expended according to the agreement between the House of Representatives and the Office of Education. I move for its adoption."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #13 to House Bill 2989. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Further Amendments."

O'Brien: "Amendment #14, Walsh. Amends House Bill 2989 as amended on page 1, line 14 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh on Amendment #14."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope that we have the same success with Amendment #14 which tends to reduce the operation budget of the State Board of Education as we've had with those up to 14, which for the most part tended to increase the budget. First of all, the Amendment has nothing whatever to do with reducing grants. Grants have been increased substantially for Fiscal Year 1976 over Fiscal Year 1975. It does reduce the operations of the Office of the State Board of Education, but it does not reduce the operation of the State Board of Education lower than they were in Fiscal Year 1975. As a matter of fact, it leaves a substantial increase in operations in the office and it was gone over very carefully by the House Republican Appropriation's Committee Staff and they came up with a substantial reduction totaling one million, four hundred ninety-one thousand dollars...four hundred ninety-one thousand, eight hundred and twenty dollars. Those reductions involve personal services which are the same as Fiscal Year 1975 and frankly it does provide that there will not be raised in salaries for the people that are working in that office at this time, and I think that



this is a poor time when there are many people in our State, nine percent of those employable out of work to be increasing salaries in public offices. It reduces contractual services so that they are equal to the Fiscal Year 1975 amount. It raises telecommunications ah...three percent over 1975 to account for increases in rate, but not increase telecommunications services, and I think that is an area where there is considerable waste. Ah...other items...ah...electronic data processing is the same equipment has been reduced substantially, and here again, if we're going to get down to a bare bones budget, I think we've got to look to equipment, not just in the Office of Education, but in other departments as well. I submit to you that this is a responsible Amendment, and one that we ought to adopt, and one that ought to be easy to adopt, because I repeat, that it does not take money from the boys and girls, Chairman Schneider, not a dime from the boys and girls, but a substantial reduction from the bureaucrats. So I move the adoption of Amendment #14, and request a Roll Call."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption on Amendment #14 to House Bill 28...2989. Discussion. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I speak in opposition to this Amendment, based on a few facts that I think the membership should be aware of. Number one, the State Board of Education is brand new. They certainly need, at least, the gear-up time that I think will take in the coming Fiscal Year to get their eggs all together and in line so that they can operate our State Educational System properly. This budget is, as introduced, a bare bones budget originally. Both the Republican staff and the Democratic staff went over with a fine tooth comb, all the requests that the State Board of Education had recommended to this Legislature in the manner of which they wanted the budget procedure to proceed. Now we're not talking about grants in this Amendment. We're not talking about equipment in this Amendment. We're talking about personnel that have to operate and have to be proficient and expertise in the area of knowing what is happening in our school districts around the state. I think this Amendment does cut, it does cut education, and educational excellence, because when you



remove the very necessary position and you remove the very necessary monies that it takes to have a good educational administration in the State Board of Education, you are ultimately going to hurt the welfare of the children in both elementary and secondary schools. I...I generally am as conservative in spending money with bureaucrats as anyone in...on this Floor of the House. In this particular case, we're talking about an... an area of government that has to...that has to re...receive our priority as number 1 in our purpose of being here as Legislators. This Amendment I think goes too far, I think it should be soundly defeated on a Roll Call so that we could go about having a good State Board of Education come back to us next year and show us what they've done with the money, show us also where they could save us money in the future. But without the tools and without the money it takes to do this next year we'll be floundering once again without the expertise in the State Board of Education that is brand new, in order to recommend to this Legislature promising only excellence in education. That's what I think we should be demanding of them. Promising to the people of Illinois the best in education, not the cheapest and I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Bradley: "The Gentleman asked for a Roll Call, I believe, on the. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan on the Amendment."

Ryan: "Well on the Amendment. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to point out that...ah...in response to Representative Hanahan's comment. The reduction in personal services takes them back only to the 1975 level and certainly that's ...ah... not out of line. We're talking about a budget with some...ah...four hundred and eighty-million dollars in it and if they can't stand a million and a half taken out...ah...then you can fool me with it. This isn't going to do anything to the education of the boys and girls, as pointed out by Representative Hanahan. This is a good, sound, fiscal measure and it should be supported by every Member of this House and I would encourage an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 14 to House Bill



2989 and he's requested...did you want to close sir? Did you wish to close. Mr. Walsh on..."

Walsh: "I'm entitled to I think. If you want to run back and ask the Speaker. I'm entitled to close, right?"

Bradley: "We didn't try to miss you. If you want to close you proceed."

Walsh: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There... there is a little confusion, I'm afraid on this. I repeat, that it does not effect grants at all. This has to do strictly with the operation of the office of the State Board of Education. Now in 19...in Fiscal, 1975. The year in which we are now, there was not a fiscal crisis. There could have been some fat in this budget for the Office of the Superintendent of the Office of Education very easily, very readily, because that was substantially over the appropriation for the year before that. All we're trying to do here is to cut the appropriation down so that it's not very much above the appropriation for the operation of that office, one year ago. Now I suggest to you that as grants, as we approach 50 per cent funding for Elementary and Secondary Education in this state. We don't have to increase the operation of the office through which that money flows, proportionately. This is a reasonable Amendment, Mr. Speaker, it is more than the Amend...than the amount of money for that office a year ago and I suggest to you that you act responsibly, that we attempt here to address ourselves to the problem we all know exists and that we do what the Constitution mandates. The Legislature should do and that's to live within the money that we anticipate will be coming. So I urge your support for Amendment #14."

Bradley: "To show our continued good relationship with that side of the aisle, we'll have a Roll Call on this Amendment as you requested sir. So the...On Amendment #14. The Gentleman offers the adoption of Amendment #14 on House Bill 2989. We'll have a Roll Call. Those opposed...those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted



who wish? The Gentleman from McHenry to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Original estimates and original requests of the State Board, which is in operation truly less than four months in true operation and people are...are talking about like they've been in operation for the prior year has really been approximately a 10 per cent increase in their request of their appropriation. They...They requested eleven million eight hundred and seventy six thousand, three hundred dollars of which...that was the 75 appropriation and then they increased their request by 1.3 million dollars which is just a little bit over 10 per cent of which we have a transfer item of Voc. Ed. of two hundred and eighty-thousand dollars which don't count because it's strictly a transferability of funds. So we're reducing down in the appropriations Amendments that we've already adopted almost three hundred thousand dollars out of their operation budget. I'd suggest that's about an 8 per cent increase in an area of very sensitive are of operating the tot... the total State Board of Education Budget which is in turn, supposedly, working back in our district, you know, making sure education works as a number one priority in Illinois. If you take away the tools and the money from the State Board of Education from doing that very job then next year you will have no right to complain when they come in with a very poor system of education coming back to the Legislature trying to explain itself. I think this Amendment is a bad Amendment. The Amendment hurts, it hurts deeply, the very people that we say we're going to hold accountable under the new Constitutional office of the State Board of Education, it's going to hurt them and keep them from having excellence in education."

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

Hudson: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'aye' vote it would seem to me that in the interest of fiscal conservatism and repreh...Representative Hanahan did mention fiscal conservatism. And it would seem to me that what we ought to be doing here as fiscal conservatives and...ah...most of us claim to be is looking for opportunities where we can reduce state expenditure at no expense



to service to those who really need it. It has been pointed out here that this in no way is going to effect or reduce the quality of education or service to our young people. That seems to be a basic concern and this modest reduction is not going to effect that area but other areas and we still will end up in appropriating more money, as Representative Walsh has pointed out, than we did last year. So it would seem to me that here's a golden opportunity to vote for an Amendment and to take a step that we can take back to our constituents and say, when they ask us, 'What are you doing to trim expenditures, to cut comeplace?', this would give us an opportunity to say, 'here's one area where we are trying and where we have hopefully succeeded in making some cuts, some saving without adversely affecting those that we want to serve the most, in this case mainly, the young people throughout the...ah...State of Illinois.' In our educational program. I'm going to say it's a good vote for you, it's a good posture, it's a good thing to be able to go back and face your constituents. They don't want to see their taxes raised. They want to cut expenses. I think they're looking to us, to shoulder this responsibility and to accept it in their behalf and in their interest. So I would urge... ah...more green lights. It's a good vote for you and your constituents and I seriously, my colleagues, would ask you to consider this as an opportunity to do what we all know must be done if we are going to avoid in another year or two or three an increase whether it's a state income tax or what else, in our taxes. I urge seriously and earnestly some more green lights. It's a good solid Amendment."

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

Schneider: "Thank you..."

Bradley: "I didn't ask anybody else but we'll start now and watch the time a little bit. We're taking too long on explanations."

Schneider: "Well very briefly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Prior to ...ah...rather right after the Governors message to

us on the urgency of the economy in Illinois and the budget...ah...

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES





I talked with some of the Members of I.O.E. and they suggested they could take some cuts in operations but nothing near this amount. So I'm suggesting that there are people who willingly want to...ah...support some...some form of reduction. I think our Committees are doing some of that but I...in the event there are more, I think we ought to take into consideration the need to continue the services. There's also, I understand a number of...ah...up to two hundred people in the Department of I.O.E. who are not paid even from last month, so it's a bit of a...ah...to heavy of a slash I would suggest and I think we ought to maintain a 'no' vote on this."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am reluctant to explain my vote. There isn't a whole lot that hasn't been said but I see that there are 19 people up there and 2 voting 'present' that have not quite made up their mind on this and in an effort to see if maybe they would in our direction let me point out again that it does not result this Amendment does not result in a reduction in the appropriation for the Office of the Superintendent of Education, under that which was appropriated less than a year ago. The year in which they're operating. As a matter of fact, as I said, there's a substantial increase in the appropriation. It is responsible and I urge you, Members of the House, to keep in mind your oath of office, what you said you would do when you took that oath and that is that you would appropriate money for the operation of state government in accordance with revenue, the revenue that we can expect. The experts tell us that we have appropriated too much. We are acting here responsibly, the way we should act. Let's look at this and select in other ways, ways in which we may reduce the operation of state government. The cost of state government, so that it doesn't effect the people too much, the people that need the services and this Amendment does not. It does not take one penny from State Aid to Education or catagorical grants for the Mentally Retarded, Special Education, other things. Just



simply the operation of the office. It's a million and a half dollars, it's a step in the right direction and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, the Majority Leader, to explain his vote."

Shea: "Well I would just like to make one comment. There's been some reference raised to the amount of revenue and that we are appropriating past that amount. Now I've heard people tell me that the revenue estimates are too high but nobody's told me what any amended or adjusted revenue estimates are and that in any way that this reduction that the Gentleman attempts to put on here will bring us in line or will take us past any revenue estimates for the state."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 'ayes', 84 'nos' and one voting 'present'. This Amendment having failed to receive the majority is hereby declared lost. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #15. Choate. Amends House Bill 2989 as amended on page 2, line 16 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, on Amendment #15 to House Bill 2989."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If the previous had been adopted I would have naturally withdrawn this Amendment. But under testimony in the Appropriation Committee II. I was saddened to learn that in many instances the witnesses, as far as this very important agency of state government, had neglected to acquaint themselves with some of the things that had happened and was happening as far as the agency was concerned. For the edification of the entire Membership many things were brought out in the Committee Hearing, that was absolutely deploring as far especially the rental, the renovation and the moving into of the new quarters of the Office of Superintendent of Education. It was pointed out, it was pointed out that there was a com...complete lack of coordination



between those in charge in the office and the contractors as far as the new building is concerned. It was pointed out that immediately upon completion of the construction of the new building that the Superintendent or his agents and the Board decided that the quarters were not ideally suited as far as Conference rooms, Hearing rooms and yes, some of the staff rooms and a brand new building that had not even been moved into now needed to be renovated and remodeled. It was also pointed out ...it was also pointed out that complete unilization of existing equipment was not being made and that much monies of the taxpayers of this state was being expended or anticipated being expended as far as new equipment is concerned. I've checked with some people who I think are knowledgeable in this area and this Amendment devotes itself only to one area as far as this appropriation is concerned and it reduces the amount of equipment money from a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars down to the figure of sixty thousand dollars or deletes sixty-five thousand dollars as far as equipment is concerned and I would appreciate and I would suggest that this would be a responsible move to the tune of sixty-thousand dollars and I would encourage the Membership to vote 'aye' on Amendment #2."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #15 to House Bill 2989. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. The Gentleman from Union Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker I appreciate the action of the Membership and I would only want to correct my previous remarks by saying that I was speaking on Amendment 15 rather than Amendment 2."

Bradley: "Well, we still adopted Amendment #15."

Choate: "Right."

Bradley: "Okay sir. Ah...Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #16. Brinkmeier. Amends House Bill 2989 on page 22 by inserting between line 17 and 18 the following, Section 2.1."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House....."



Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. By way of explaining Amendment #16, I'll have to give you a little history of what's happening here. In 1971 we passed the critical health problems conference of Health Education Act, mandating that Health Education be taught in our school. Now most of you will remember that earlier in this Session we passed out of here House Bill 37 which appropriated some money for summer workshops for Health Teachers. Apparently when the I.O.E. budget was prepared they were going on last years figures and they did not realize that there wasn't anything in there to provide for further training of Health Teachers. That is why this...this Amendment is being offered. What it would do would be to appropriate one hundred and ninety-one thousand dollars for summer workshops and for extension courses of next year to train the in service training of our present teachers so that they would be better qualified to teach health. What happened after we passed the...the Bill in 71. The O.S.P.I. office conducted a survey and discovered that about 5 per cent of those teachers teaching Health, were qualified to teach and that brought forth the need for this type of Legislation to provide for workshops and extension courses so that our youngsters would have qualified teachers teaching health to them. I would urge adoption of Amendment 16."

Bradley: "The Amendm...The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #16 to House Bill 2989. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Bradley: "Third Reading. For the benefit of our guests in the Gallery you are unable to, should not be taking pictures. On Second Reading appears...Turn it off. 2989.....Pardon me. 3034. Mr. Boyle on the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 3034. Boyle. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Veterans Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle.....Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 3062."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3062. Berman. A Bill for an Act to amend Section...or Article 36 of the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill was read a Second time previously....and #1 was...tabled..."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. To bring you up to date. Amendment 1 was adopted. Everything following that, Amendments 2 through 10 were tabled. I think we are now on Amendment 11."

Jack O'Brien: "Okay."

Bradley: "Amendment #11."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #11. House...Amends House Bill 3062 on page 11 line 19 by inserting after 'Article' the following."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "I don't see Mr. Huff on the Floor, but I do know that he has filed 11...Amendment 13 which is the corrected Amendment to the Bill as amended, so I would suggest that we table 11 because it's not in proper form. 13 is the same Amendment."

Bradley: "The Gentleman offers to table then, Amendment #11 and it is now tabled. Amendment...Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #12. Washington. Amends House Bill 3062 as amended in the first sentence of Section 705 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Ah...Representative Washington...ah...filed Amendment 12. He's down in Judiciary I Committee Hearing. He indicated to me that he wished to table Amendment...ah...12."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #12 then. Ah...leave to table. It is now tabled. Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #13. Huff. Amends House Bill 3062 as amended in Section 705 by inserting a new sub-paragraph to read as follows."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman on Amendment #13."



Berman: I want to indicate, I have not been able to speak personally with Mr. Huff. He wasn't on the Floor today. I'm told, but that's strictly secondary, that he intended to table 13. If I find out later that is not his intention, I'll bring the Bill back from third but it...ah...So I would ask that we...ah..."

Bradley: "The Gentleman offers to table Amendment #13. Any discussion? Further discussion? If not...If not the Amendment then is tabled. Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #14. Deuster. Amends House Bill 3062 as amended by inserting before Section 702, the following."

Bradley: "The Gentl...the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #14 will allow the expenses under the no fault Act to include payment for benefits for nonmedical remedial care and treatment rendered in accordance with recognized religious method of healing. Of the 20 states that have No Fault Insurance, this provision is in all of their laws. This does cover the instance of the Christian Science Sanitarium and the...the healing of it is recognized by Christian Science Practitioners. I would...I urge the adoption of Amendment #14."

Bradley: "The Gentleman offers the adoption of Amendmet #14 to House Bill 3062. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 3068....68..."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3068. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously and Amendment #1 was...Amendment #1 lost. Amendment #2. Downs. Amends House Bill 3068 on page 2 by deleting all of line 8 through 13 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs on Amendment #2."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This..ah.. Amendment has been drafted now in a form to eliminate the extent that it's passable. Some misunderstandings and objections to...ah... the Amendment which is the Bill and...ah...I move for your favorable



consideration of this Amendment. It clearly shows that the only change in the Amendment is to require annual rather than periodic review. Nothing else has changed. This clears up some objections and misunderstanding that is supported by the Legislative Advisory Commission. It's the Committee Bill in its clearest form and I urge your favorable vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters on the Amendment."

Peters: "Will Judge Downs yield."

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Peters: "Ah...Judge Downs...ah...Representative Downs, excuse me, I'm a little ahead of my time. Representative Downs, how is this Amendment different than the Amendment was defeated a day or two ago?"

Downs: "The Amendment that was offered a day or two ago took the first section of...ah...the Amendment in the form now and amended the Public Aid Code in a different place and in doing so...ah...that's the section that refers to...ah... nothing obligating the General Assembly to appropriate...ah... or not...ah...anything differently than what they do now. The way it was set up before was confusing. It was stuck in a different place...ah...I've put it in now so that it immediately follows the annual rather than periodic change so that there can be no further misunderstanding as there have been as to whether or not this was requiring any automatic increase..."

Peters: "Does your Amendment answer the...the questions in regard to the possible conflicts with Federal Rules and Regulations in regard to the awarding of General Assistance money?"

Downs: "Yes."

Peters: "It...it settles that problem?"

Downs: "Absolutely. That is not an issue with this Amendment or the Bill in this form."

Peters: "Does the Bill as amended in any way mandate...mandate cost of living increases?"

Downs: "No."

Peters: "Does this Amendment in any way put the State Treasury in the position or the Department of Public Aid of having to pay out increased Public Aid payments without appropriations

of those monies by the General Assembly?"



Downs: "No, that is exactly why the Amendment is for the purpose of making those points clear and...and read the Amendment literally and it says exactly just what you're asking about."

Peters: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners on the Amendment."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in support of the Amendment. I have a copy in front of me and the answers that Representative Downs has provided to Representative Peters is correct. The only substantive change that is being made in the law as it presently exists is the change from periodic review of the cost of living to mandate an annual review of the cost of living. Additional wording indicates that the...the cost of living or any aid payment made shall not exceed those funds which are appropriated for that purpose by the Illinois General Assembly. So total Fiscal control remains with this body which I personally think is important. But I also think that the change that is being proposed in this Amendment or in this Bill, if this Amendment is added is that an annual review be made of...for Aid recipients...ah... As a Member of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. I know from personal experience in my own county that the Department is not as aggressive as I believe it ought to be in keeping abreast of what it costs for any citizen, whether they be on Public Aid or somebody who is employed to live in various areas and I think that this will help those of us who are Legislative Members of that body...ah...put us in a better position to interpret the budget requests which were, will be presented to the General Assembly and I would urge that this House...ah... vote in favor of Amendment #2."

Bradley: "The Gentlemm from Cook, Mr. Houlihan on Amendment #2."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in support of this Amendment. I think this Amendment now in its ... in it's present form deals with a very sensitive problem, a very difficult problem. I think the Sponsor shows very good faith in trying to work with all the parties involved,





answer some of the questions that were raised earlier and I would merely ask that everybody give this a favorable vote. I don't think it raises any serious difficulties with the Department I think all the problems that were originally talked about have been worked out and I think this is an excellent Amendment and ask for an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman wish to close? If not, the Gentleman offers Amendment #2 to House Bill 3068. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Amendments adopted. Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 3100."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3100. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Bradley: "Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends House Bill 3100. Ebbesen. On page 1, line 2 by changing 2 and so forth."

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

Ebbesen: "Ah, yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, I'd like leave of the House to table ...ah... Amendments #1 and 2. They're not in proper form and...ah.."

Bradley: "The Gentleman asks leave to table House...or Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3100. Hearing no objection the Amendments are tabled. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Ebbesen. Amends House Bill 3100 on page 1, line 2 and so forth."

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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On Amendment #3 and I'd like the House to pay very close attention to these Amendment...ah...relative to House Bill 3100. This is particular Bill...ah...addresses itself to...ah...authorizing the...ah...sale of beer and wine on our university campuses and this Bill, well I'd better stay on the Amendment...ah...The... Amendment #3. If they're going to have the sale of beer and wine that Amendment #3 provides that, you know, we don't pay



Real Estate Taxes on State property but that exemption provided for in the section does not apply to the premise of a State University or Community College where beer and wine are being sold and I'm talking exclusively for that particular areas. Specifically whether, for sale of the beer and wine and...ah I'd be very happy to respond to any questions. I do believe in local control. I am not for this particular piece of Legislation but in fact if it does pass out I think that there should be a...ah...certain stipulations relative to the property."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann on the Amendment."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker...ah...would the Sponsor yield to a few questions here?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Mann: "Ah...Representative Ebbesen are you submitting this Amendment which would remove the tax exemption status of institutions of higher learning throughout the State of Illinois? Are you submitting this at the request of the Board of Higher Education? Or the Regents?"

Ebbesen: "No."

Mann: Well may I ask at whose request are you submitting this a... this Amendment which would remove tax exempt status for the institutions of higher learning?"

Ebbesen: "Ah...You're making a very broad statement. This only applies as the Amendment reads, to that specific area of any university in the state where they are, where beer and wine are being sold as far as that...ah...ah...tax exempt portion is concerned. Not the entire state owned property."

Mann: "Well you don't define..."

Ebbesen: "Pardon."

Mann: "Well you don't define premise herein. You want to tax the university. Now the university does not pay taxes. Am I right, they sell wine and beer and liquor in faculty lounges and we sell them at state parks. Do they pay taxes on the sale of wine and beer at those various institutions?"



Ebbesen: "Well are you addressing yourself to my Amendment?"

Mann: "I'm asking you whether or not they...whether or not taxes are levied on faculty lounges where wine and beer are sold and liquor at state institutions."

Ebbesen: "Well...ah...in this particular case if it would fall in this particular category...ah...the answer to that would be 'yes' if this Amendment was adopted and became law."

Mann: "But at the present time they do not."

Ebbesen: "You know the answer to that already Representative."

Mann: "Well, I asked you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to this question."

Bradley: Proceed sir."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We now sell alcoholic beverages at institutions of higher learning in faculty lounges at state airports and state parks. Now the Gentleman is seeking, by his own admission since he opposes the Bill to scuttle the Bill by imposing a tax on a state institution which I don't even know is Constitutional. They are now exempt from taxes. But the point of the matter here is that every institution of higher learning, which is a part of the University of Illinois or the Board of Regents and the Student Association across the state are in favor of the sale of wine and beer to 19 year olds and faculty unions under supervision. This has been tried in other states. It's been tried successfully. Now I...I respect the Gentleman, he's a Member of the Committee on Higher Education but DeKalb Illinois is not the only city in the State, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House and I submit to you that if the Gentleman opposes this Bill, let him oppose it on Third Reading. Let him not put on a Bill for the first time on the statute books of the State of Illinois imposing taxation on institutions of higher learning. This is a bad Amendment, it would cripple the operations of universities by imposing taxes on them and opening the door for taxes on other aspects of the enterprise of universities. The universities don't want it in your community, the students in



in your communities don't want it, and I don't know who does want it, but perhaps a few people in DeKalb, Illinois, and I would suggest to you that the State is bigger than DeKalb. I would ask you to defeat this Amendment. Let the Bill go up or down on Third Reading."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a Good Amendment. Let's be very pragmatic about it. If governmental units are growing into the private enterprise business of selling any type of commodity, then they should be in the same competitive atmosphere as that of private enterprise. Private enterprise must pay taxes upon the dwelling in which they operated a business. Private enterprise is subject to all the restrictions and all the impositions of government to support their fair share of the tax situation, so if governmental units in principle are going to be parts of the private enterprise system and go in competition with private enterprise, then they should be following the same type of stipulation, same type of requirements and assume the same type of financial burdens as private enterprise. So I feel this Amendment has a great deal of merit to it. I think Representative Ebbesen is to be commended for bringing forth an Amendment that sets up a philosophy that should be articulated as a legislative body, that a government, units of government are going to go into the private enterprise business, competing against the ordinary business men, then they should also follow the same type of restrictions and the requirements, so I think this is a good Amendment and I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Bradley: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, point of information."

Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Deavers: "And I would like to ask a question of the Chair. House Bill 3100 has come back now, and I want to know how it can come back as a Committee Bill, when it had a fair hearing and was killed on the Floor of this House before May 23."

Bradley: "It's a Committee Bill and it can be brought back at the discretion of the Committee, just as other Committee Bills have been brought



out of those Committees, and I don't see anything wrong with it."

Deavers: "Even though it has been killed once by the vote of the Members?"

Bradley: "It was a different number, so it's a Committee Bill, and they have the right to do just what they're doing with the Bill."

Deaver: "Then I chastise that Committee, and I would formally protest."

Bradley: "Your protest will be so noted. The Gentleman from ah.....

Madison, Mr..... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, on a Point of Order."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ah..... I take exception to the Gentleman's remarks. I'm Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education and this matter was heard according to the Rules. It was voted out by the necessary majority of those on the Committee, and I think the Gentleman's remarks are entirely out of line, and I don't think he ought to chastise the Committee. I think he ought to apologize to the Committee. We have a perfect right to vote out a Committee Bill, Representative."

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

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

Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question prevails. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, wish to close?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, very briefly, ah..... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah.....you know, when you start talking about State institutions, paying a tax, this is really relatively nothing new because I know ah..... that in special assessment districts, the State there's always been special appropriations that have gone through this General Assembly for paying in a form of a tax, a special assessment, relative to ah..... improvements made as far as the university, on campus and so forth, and you know what the issue is, and I would appreciate your favorable reaction to this Amendment."

Bradley: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 3100. All in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. We'll have a roll call. The Chair is unable to determine. We'll take a Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."



Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to explain my 'yes' vote. It's been said when the other Bill was defeated on Third Reading, I took the position at that time, that I took a few years ago when the University of Carbondale wished to build motel and hotel facilities, and my prediction was totally right at that time, because the motel and hotel business totally is suffering in Carbondale today, without competition from the University. Now I think it's high time we in the Legislature quit playing willy-nilly and bowing down every that that a group of students wants to do something. You better start considering the business community, and the people that pay the taxes to make that university possible and provide the higher education for the students that go to that university. I don't find anything so terribly wrong in having a State institution meet its financial obligations the same as a business man does. If I owned a tavern, and I don't, but if I did own one in Carbondale or any other college community in this State, I would deeply resent the legislature saying to a public institution, 'yes you can go into competition with me at the expense of the taxpayers dollars'. I would resent it terribly, and you can't compare it with the operation of State parks. You can't compare the operation of the university with state parks. You and I know that we do not we do not subscribe as far as the taxpayers dollars are concerned, in the State parks like we do in the educational system. You and I know that the individual that visits that State park pays more than his fair share to afford and to enjoy the opportunities of the facilities that are there, and if I'm not mistaken, there is some taxes collected, as far as the dispensing of alcoholic beverages in a State park. I'm not positive of that, but I think there is. I think this Amendment should be adopted."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House....."

Bradley: "We're going to use the clock on the timer."

Dyer: "Well, now, it wasn't used on the previous speaker, and I'm taking the opposite side. I really think I'm entitled to equal time. However, I would like to appeal to the reason of the Members of the



General Assembly, as a Co-sponsor of the basic bill. I object to this Amendment, and I want you to think what you're doing. Already, at the University of Illinois and at many other of our Universities, that the faculty is permitted to serve liquor and have it for sale in their faculty centers. There was no movement to tax this. Now when the students want to do the same thing to the Student Unions and help pay off a little bit of the indebtedness of these student unions, there is objection. I want you to think about the logical conclusion of this. If you're going to dig in, then to the tax exempt status of universities, then you're going to have to look next to the churches. Now, if you're a protestant, Member of a protestant church, as I am, that means we ladies cannot have our bazaar and sell items in our church. You're going to have to begin to tax churches. You're going to have to look carefully at bingo games, and other ways that churches earn their money. You're taking a much more far reaching step by this innocent sounding Amendment. It's a debt you're going to regret and I wish everyone would stop and think, it's an illogical Amendment and it does not belong on this Bill."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr.

Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Well, I have a.... we have some taverns on our land. We don't pay the taxes ourselves. They do, and I know they are exceedingly high. I know they're having a tough time. I think, and we have a university. I think it's incredible that the People that are trying to sustain themselves and make a living and try to pay the taxes, have to compete in this way with a university. It's morally wrong and illegally wrong. And as far as a Bill to equalize, do something about what should be done, and I hope I remember to do this next time. We should put in a Bill to see that the university professors also pay their share of the tax and not be competing with the hardworking people who are trying to make a living and pay these high taxes, that they are forced to do and that we've put on them, so I say we should vote 'yes'."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote."



Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, for years, for years, these college towns have come to this Legislature to ask us to spend money for buildings, to turn their sleepy cow towns into prosperous college towns. Now we've done that. Now, they won't even give these students the right to have a drink on the campus. They're so out to gouge the students, which they do on private housing, which they do on clothing, and now on liquor. They won't even let the student have a drink in the safety of the student union. They want to get them out to the tavern. They want to get them driving on the streets after he's been drinking, and won't even let them have a drink, won't even let them have a drink in the student union. It's selfishness. They want the universities to build the buildings there, they want us to build the building there, but once they get the students there, they gouge them, and I'm going to predict what is going to happen to some of these outlying college towns. Their attendance is going to decline. They are going to stay home and go to community colleges. They're tired of being gouged. They're tired of being gouged in towns throughout the State with normal schools, or with teachers college that we built up as a great universities, while the local merchants take every advantage of the student they can, and the opposition to this Bill is another case of the local town's people taking every advantage against the student, not allowing the student union to serve liquor in the student union, but insisting that every student come into the tavern for a drink, and I think it's a bad Amendment and we should defeat it."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, to explain his vote."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the Representative from DuPage brought the faculty center at U of I to our attention. I think perhaps the Bill next year to vote that out would be appropriate."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I would say that when the churches start to sell booze, I'd vote for putting them on the tax rolls, too."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."





Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm going to lay this right on the line, in voting green on this Bill. You are voting for the special interest of a few people in these towns who live off the students, who have made these towns commercially viable. Now the universities want this Bill, because they recognize what's happened to students, and I'm talking about serious problems, being drunk off campus, been involved in accidents, involved in rape and involved in other problems. Now you want to talk about taxation, let's start taxing the cafeterias on campus, the housing on campus, the book-stores on campus and every aspect of universities rights."

Bradley: "The....."

Mann: "Now you wait a minute, Mr. Speaker, I haven't concluded my explanation of vote, Sir, if I may."

Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Mann: "Thank you, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, universities will have to approve the sale of wine and beer in any student union before it can be implemented. That's written into this Bill, but to take a Bill like this and cripple it, because a few people who have been the beneficiaries of the students partonage, and who have benefited from lowering the drinking age from 21 to 19 and now to say on moral grounds, if you will, protecting some saloon keepers, and excuse me to one of my colleagues whom I respect dearly, but that's what all this Amendment is about, I think is absolutely against the best interest of the People of Illinois, and I would, at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, ask for a verification."

Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to explain my vote by saying that I believe schools should teach. If students want to drink, they certainly can, but if they want to drink, I also think we should consider that these tied interests that my colleague talks about, these special interests, are the people who are helping to make business and provide free enterprise and some of these are parents of these very students who are trying to send their students to school to learn, not to sit and drink. I don't care if anyone wants to drink, but when you want to say that these taverns are special interest, well, if you'd rather have booze,



and wine and beer sold on the street corners, that's fine with me, but I don't like it. I would rather it be served in a place that's licensed to do it, and I certainly will vote for the Bill with this Amendment. I don't think there's anything wrong with it, and I urge more 'aye' votes."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, wishes to explain his vote."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'no' vote, ah..... I attempted to ask a question before the previous question was called. It appears to me that ah..... well, I don't know, maybe student unions ought to be taxed, if they're going to sell wine and beer, but as I look at this Amendment, it appears to me that if this Bill passes, with the Amendment intact, that the universities are not going to be taxed on that portion of property where the wine and beer is sold, but they're going to be taxed on all property, and I think for that basis, this is..... it seems rather ridiculous to me, if a university sells wine and beer in the student union, for that university to have to be taxed on all of its property. It may end up paying more tax on its property, then it will gain in Revenue from the sale of wine and beer, and so I think it's a bad amendment, and I vote 'no'."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman to close, Mr. Coffey, to explain his vote."

Coffey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to explain my vote. From some of the comments made previously about getting in cars and driving rather than having beer on campus. I've been to several campuses and I happen to live in a campus town, and I know that you don't have to get into a car to drive, unless you can't walk a block. We have three facilities within a block of the campus at Eastern Illinois University and it's a matter of only walking across the street, so a free enterprise business that pays taxes and helps keep that university running, and I know we have the same at other universities in this State, and I think when we get down.... I don't care if we're talking about book stores or anything else, and we're competing with free enterprise with tax money. I think it's a bad way for us to go, and I urge more green lights on this Amendment."



Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, to explain his vote."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we should get some more red lights up there, and I'll tell you why. If any of you have any daughters or sons or if any of you went to the private colleges and universities in Illinois, if you went to DuPaul, or you're going to send somebody there, of to Loyola or to Northwestern or the University of Chicago, or any of the small schools, that are having trouble surviving in Illinois, when they're coming down to us, these private universities in competition and illegitimate, open, Democratic composition with the public universities that we fund so largely, and those schools are having trouble in their very survival. If any of you are aware of the tuition rates that are going constantly upward in those private schools, the difficulty they're having in competing, you would not really want to injure the tax exempt status of those universities. It seems to me that if I send a child off to college, I want that child, if that child is going to drink, to be able to do it in a circumstance which is as close to protected and homelike as can be found, and if that includes being on the campus and staying on the campus, I would want to encourage, even though I wouldn't particularly want to encourage any drinking. I really do think if we're going to help our private colleges and universities, we should vote 'no' on this Bill."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "In explaining my 'yes' vote, some today have illuded to the fact of the problem or the question of fraternal or religious organizations paying tax on the private enterprise. They have to pay tax now if they are in competition or they run a private enterprise business. They have to pay that portion of their taxes on that property if they hold themselves out to the General public for the taking or doing business with the General public. Religious organizations have to do it for that type of commerical property, that's being used for that purpose, as well as fraternal organizations, so this is the new concept. I think it's probably basic just common, economic sense, that a private institutions want to get into the free enterprise system, then they



should get in with both feet and also assume all those responsibilities."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "The issue on this that we're addressing here is clearly a lot larger than this small Amendment. The question is, whether a profit-making enterprise in nonprofit institutions should be taxed. I personally think they should. One Gentleman has illuded, or has suggested that the entire student union building, for instance, would be subject to property tax if this Amendment passed. Well, I can't find the Amendment, so I can't directly address that question, but I do know that it would be conceivable to develop a property tax system that would be based on the leasehold. You would apply a property tax to the leasehold and you would define the amount of tax based on the flow of income in that particular space, rather than on the structure, for instance. So it is a viably... it is a viable plan and the General Assembly should address the exemption problem in general. For instance, did you know that thirteen percent of the loop is not even on the tax rolls right now. But this Amendment, I think, if we're going to pass it, is a significant amendment. It certainly does have large range implications, and I hope Members of the this General Assembly will start thinking about the basic questions underlying it."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Champaign, to explain his 'present' vote."

"Mr. Speaker, I guess it's my understanding under the ruling that was handed down that the present vote is the same as a 'no' vote on Amendments. Is that correct?"

Bradley: "It will be counted that way, yes Sir."

"Well, then, because I do have a conflict of interest, I'd just like to be recorded as 'not voting' at all. I can't do that on my button."

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as 'not voting'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 88 'ayes', 74 'nos'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, has asked for a verification. Do you persist in your



request Sir?"

Mann: "Yes Sir, I do."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Ebbesen, I supposed is asking for a poll of the absentees. Correct Sir? Mr. Ebbesen requests...the Clerk will call the absentees. Poll the absentees."

O'Brien: "Capparelli. Collins. D'Arco. Ralph Dunn. Huff. Schlickman. Terzich. Totten. VanDuyne. VonBoeckman. Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Proceed with the verification of the affirmative vote."

O'Brien: "Anderson. Arnell. Berman. Borchers. Boyle. Bradley. Brummet. Campbell. Capuzi. Carroll. Choate. Coffey. Cunningham. Daniels. Deavers. Deuster. DiPrima. John Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Fary. Fleck. Flinn. Friedland. Friedrich. Geo-Karis. Griesheimer. Grotberg. Hanahan. Hart. Hill. Gene Hoffman. Ron Hoffman. Hudson."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, arise?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, permission of Mr. Mann, I've asked to be verified now, at the present time. I have a meeting I have to attend."

Bradley: "Fine. You're verified Sir. We'll proceed."

O'Brien: "Jacobs. J. D. Jones. Keller. Kelly. Kent. Kosinski. Kozubowski. LaFleur. Lauer. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Londrigan. Luft."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, arise?"

Hart: "I wonder if I could be verified? I need to be over in the Senate, and with leave of the House, I'd like to be verified on the 'aye' Roll Call at this time."

Bradley: "The Gentleman is verified."

O'Brien: "Mahar. McAuliffe. McAvoy. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Miller. Mudd. Nardulli. O'Daniel. Palmer. Neff. Porter. Richmond. Rigney. Rose. Ryan. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sevcik. Simms. Skinner. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stone. Tipword. Tuerk. Waddell. Wall. Washburn. Williams. Winchester. Younge, and Yourell."

Bradley: "Question of the affirmative vote?"



Bradley: "By Mr. Mann. Turn him on."

Mann: "Yourell."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen arise?"

Ebbesen: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear that at the appropriate time, I'd like to verify the negative Roll Call."

Bradley: "Will do. Yourell? Mr. Yourell on the Floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "What is the count now Mr. Speaker, can you tell me?"

Bradley: "There were 88, and we just took Mr. Yourell off, it would seem to me it would be 87. Correct Clerk?"

Mann: "Ah...Sevcik?"

Bradley: "Sevcik? Representative Sevcik's on the Floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Klosak? Oh, forgive me, he's voting with me, alright. Schisler?"

Bradley: "Representative Schisler's in the center aisle."

Mann: "Representative Rose?"

Bradley: "Representative Rose's in the Chambers on the far side."

Mann: "Representative Palmer?"

Bradley: "Representative Palmer? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Representative Neff?"

Bradley: "Representative Neff? Is Representative Neff in the Chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Representative Nardulli?"

Bradley: "Representative Nardulli's in his seat."

Mann: "Representative McCourt?"

Bradley: "Representative McCourt? Representative McCourt in the Chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Representative McAuliffe?"

Bradley: "Representative McAuliffe? Representative McAuliffe in the Chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Representative McClain?"

Bradley: "Representative McClain? Representative McClain in the...he's in the Chambers, Republican side."

Mann: "Representative Londrigan?"

Bradley: "Representative Londrigan? Representative Londrigan in the Chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Representative Boyle?"

Bradley: "Representative Boyle? Representative Boyle in the Chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Representative Laurino?"

Bradley: "Representative Laurino? Representative Laurino in the Chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Mann: "Representative Leinenweber?"

Bradley: "Representative Leinenweber is in his chair. Representative Neff has returned to the Chambers. Put him back on the Roll. Proceed Sir."

Mann: "Representative Gene Hoffman?"

Bradley: "Gene Hoffman? Is Gene Hoffman in the Chambers? Representative Gene Hoffman? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Representative McCourt has returned. Put him back on."

Mann: "Representative McPartlin?"

Bradley: "Representative McPartlin? Is the Gentleman in the Chambers?"



How's he recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Do you wish to have him taken off the 'no' vote Sir?"

Mann: "I strike that. I'm sorry. Mr. DiPrima?"

Bradley: "Representative DiPrima? He's in his seat."

Mann: "Representative Cunningham?"

Bradley: "Representative Cunningham? The Gentleman in the Chambers?"

How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Further questions, Sir?"

Mann: "Representative Ron Hoffman?"

Bradley: "Representative Ron Hoffman. Is he back there? Will you stand up please so he...I see the hand. He's in his seat. Further questions, Sir?"

Mann: "Representative Stearney?"

Bradley: "Pardon Sir? Stearney? He's in his...in the aisle. Further questions of the affirmative Roll Sir?"

Mann: "No."

Bradley: "Representative Laurino, I believe was taken off the Roll. He has returned. Put him back on the Roll."

Mann: "May I have a count Sir?"

Bradley: "Just a minute. What's the count Sir? Representative Cunningham has returned. How was he recorded Mr. Clerk? We now have 81 'ayes', 74 'nays'. This Amendment having received the majority is hereby declared adopted. Further Amendments."

O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Ebbesen. Amends House Bill 3100 on page 2, line 8 by inserting after college, the following and so forth."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, arise?"

Mann: "Mr. Speaker...ah...I'll save the Gentleman some trouble. Ah...at this time I would like to ask leave to table House Bill 3100...ah...in doing so Mr. Speaker...ah...in doing so Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take note of the fact that 74 members did support the position of the universities and the students of this state and we'll be back next Bill, and I'm sorry...next Session rather. I'm sorry that we took up this much time of the House, but it was an important issue."

Bradley: "The Gentleman asks leave to table House Bill 3100. Hearing no





objections. You have objections to him tabling? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Skinner: "Well, I certainly rise to register an objection. The Bill is now in pretty good shape."

Bradley: "The Gentleman has moved to table. There has been objections on the...asking leave to table. Now do you want to move to table Sir? Turn Mr. Mann on."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker. Just take it out of the Record."

Bradley: "Take it out of the Record, and we'll hold it on Second Reading. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, wish recognition?"

Ebbesen: "Ah...yes Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to make a point very clear here. Ah...you know I'm not in opposition to the young people having their beer and wine. I voted for the lowering of the drinking age, and I'd also like to say that there are two additional Amendments that I have proposed for this particular piece of legislation. One would provide that the State universities or community college would obtain a local liquor license if they were to go with this Bill, if it were to become law. Second and thirdly, the following Amendment would say that it would go to a private concessioner with the...the...paying a property tax and with the other stipulations, I certainly would be in favor of seeing these young people on campus having their beer and wine."

Bradley: "Mr. Ebbesen, the Gentleman had requested leave to table, and now he asked for it to be taken out of the record. We spent forty-five minutes on that Amendment. I...and with leave and with your leave Sir, and I'm not correcting you Sir, we'd like to go on to another Bill. We'll go to House Bill 3113, Mr. Lechowicz."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3113. A Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Comptroller to pay for legal services in relation to certain federal tax...."

Bradley: "For clarification proposes now. House Bill 3100 is now on Second Reading with the Amendment adopted, and that's where it'll be. Go ahead Mr. Lechowicz, the Gentleman from Cook on House Bill 3113."

O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Bradley: "Amendments from the Floor."

O'Brien: "None."



JUN 11 1975

84.

Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 3114, Mr. Lechowicz."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3114. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to Comptroller for certain federal employment tax assessment. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Bradley: "Any Floor Amendments?"

O'Brien: "None."

Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 3115."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3115. A Bill for an Act in relation to Residential Mortgages and Foreclosures, assess mortgages. Second Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman...ah...Amendments?"

O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Bradley: "Amendments from the Floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Hart. Amends House Bill 3115 on page 2, line 3, by inserting in full immediately after preprepaid."

Bradley: "I believe the Gentleman from Franklin asked...stated that he was going to a Senate Committee. Mr. Leon is Mr. Hart on the Floor? You want to proceed with the Amendment Sir, or do you oppose the Amendment? Turn Mr. Leon ...Representative Hart has four Amendments, he's in a Senate Committee. Could we take this out of the Record, and we'll come back to it"

Leon: "Alright."

Bradley: "How about House Bill 3116?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 3116. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to judgments. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Bradley: "Amendments from the Floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 3117."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3117. "

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, arise?"

Leinenweber: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "State your point."

Leinenweber: "Have these Bills been distributed? I don't find them on my desk. I got to 3115 and that's it."

Bradley: "Pages, have those been distributed? The Gentlemen on our side



seem to have 3116 and 3117. Have they been distributed over here?

Mr. Borchers has them, Mr. Leinenweber. Proceed with the Bill, 3117."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3117. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act, Various Township Acts of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Bradley: "Amendments from the Floor?"

O'Brien: "None."

Bradley: "Third Reading. We have just turned on, for the information of the Members, the lights so that pictures can be taken. We'll turn up the volume, so we'll get a nice clear picture. Senate Bills, Third Reading. On the Calendar on Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 91. Mr. Rayson on the Floor? Read the Bill Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Madison: "Mr Speaker, because of the fact that in addition to Senate Bills Third Reading we do have some House Bills Third Reading that still have to go to the Senate. I would wonder if the Chair would not consider going to House Bills, Third Reading so we could move those out of here?"

Bradley: "We'll get to those as soon as we can Sir. We're going to go to Senate Bills, Third Reading, and move along with them."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 91. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 91 merely provides that a person charged with violating the Illinois Ethics Act in such a way that it's an indictable offense shall be tried in the county in which he resides. Now this rose out of Senator Neistein's situation where he mailed in a form to Springfield and he's tried and indicted by Sangamon Grand Jury and eventually acquitted. We feel in this area...in this area, under this rather unique Act that the filing of forms, if there is anything arising out of it that's a definite indictable offense, the person involved should be tried in the county in which he lives for revenue purposes only, rather than get involved with political .....elsewhere, and I urge a favorable vote."

Bradley: "Is there any further discussion. If not, the question is shall



Senate Bill 91 pass? All those in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question we have 107 'ayes', 5 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 101."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 101. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

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

Ah...Senate Bill 101...ah...provides that prior to a preliminary hearing or examination, a defendant in a criminal case has the right to subpoena witnesses. He has the right to appear at that preliminary hearing and it be heard and present witnesses material to the proceedings, and thereafter to cross examine witnesses. Now, this is essentially...sets up some additional body of rights for defendants in the first stage of criminal proceedings. This becomes even more crucial in the recognition of the defendant's rights, since two days ago when this House passed Senate Bill 286, which was sponsored by Representative Houlihan here...ah...which allows a prosecutor to go around the Grand Jury System essentially. And my guess is, that that is what we're going to have in Illinois. We're going to have in...unless there's some investigative problem we are going to have a bypass of the Grand Jury Systems from now on, so that this becomes a extremely critical part of granting defendants substantial due process in their own defense. I might add that it's not particularly new in the law, federal defendant's are accorded this right by Supreme Court rule, by, I'm sorry, by Rule 5C of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Other states have similar proceedings as well. It is an important Bill in a, in a...ah... criminal justice, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, particularly those of you who are concerned with swifter justice...swifter criminal justice. This Bill of Senator Nudelman's is the Bill your State's Attorney has been fighting against. We've been striving for



for swifter criminal justice. Now proponents of this measure indicate that this has a potential of bypassing the Grand Jury and will speed up justice. However, I submit that when we give the right of subpoena in a preliminary hearing, and consequence...ah...consequential possibilities of continuances, the effect of the Bill literally is a primitive skilled defense attorney to force two full blown trials in criminal proceedings. This is a defense attorney's Bill. Not consistent with speedy justice, and I sincerely urge its defeat."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I, also, would like to point out to the Members of this House, that is a extremely detrimental Bill to Law Enforcement and to the Criminal Justice System. It is violently opposed by the Illinois State's Attorney Association and, individually, by virtually all of the state's attorneys in the State. It changes the procedure of the...of the preliminary hearing from a sorting...ah...procedure in order to determine which case is justified prosecution to what will amount to what is even more than a full scale trial because it will become a discovery vehicle for the defendant to interrogate each and every single witness that the state has in order to present its case. Now the procedure permits the... under this Bill, the defendant to subpoena any person he chooses, and to introduce evidence that is material. There's no requirement of relevancy, merely that the evidence be material to the proceedings, which will allow the most widespread extraordinarily broad scope of inquiry. This will be unbelievably time consuming and will delay justice in our system. Also, the Bill goes beyond that, and probably in terms of several of the witnesses who testified at the hearing in Judiciary Committee, probably will result in the prohibition of introduction of hearsay testimony. This means that a person who was arrested, let's say, for a drug charge or for murder, where evidence of blood analysis or analysis of drugs are concerned, that the particular state agency or agent who conducts the individual test as to determination of the composition of the material would have to be called, personally, to testify. Otherwise the individual would not be permitted to be held or to be brought to trial. This is a very very



bad Bill. Will probably disrupt the administration of justice in Illinois to an untold degree. Analysis with federal court procedures is not relevant. The Federal Criminal Justice System is completely different in both caseload and complexity of cases. I certainly join with the Gentleman from Cook in urging a 'no' vote to this very very bad Bill."

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

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Darrow: "Mr. Greiman, how will this...if this Bill is enacted, how will preliminary hearing differ from that of a trial on the merits?"

Greiman: "Oh, I think that when the court has, in fact, found probable cause I think the court can then cut the proceedings rather short. My guess is that...ah...a state's attorney, I think would concede, this would not be used in every situation, you know. Ah...criminal lawyers don't have the energy or the time to put to that. But I think, and I think it's going to be used in those cases where it will be significant. Ah...but I think once the court does determine its probable cause, they can cut, the court can cut it off, because the ultimate issue in a preliminary hearing is in fact their probable cause. When he comes to that conclusion, he can cut off the hearing. As far as the relevancy, I think relevancy is always within the preview of the court. The matters brought up must be germane, and we know that."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill?"

Bradley: "Proceed Sir."

Darrow: "I feel that this Bill should be defeated. What we are going to require now is for the storekeeper who is robbed or buglarized, or the rape victim to come down to a preliminary hearing and be dragged through the mud by defense attorney, inconvenienced going through a process of two trials. It will mean that the defense attorney will, again, use this for another reason to appeal cases. Our Appeal Courts, our Appeal Trial Lawyers, our Appeal Defense Counsel, will again be burdened with a number of appeals. There's very little merit in this Bill and I would urge that it be defeated."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."



Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Lucco: "Am I interpreting this Bill correctly when I'm assuming that as it is worded, a defendant may do these things the Bill so states, himself, without the use of an Attorney at Law?"

Greiman: "Well, I suppose he could, ha,ha,ha...if he were sufficiently tuned in to criminal procedure, sure, but you know, generally you have a lawyer to represent you."

Lucco: "I recommend it, Joe. Generally, is it necessary?"

Greiman: "No."

Lucco: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. One thing I want to run right into the teeth of and that is the House Sponsor's statement that the judge can cut off a probable cause hearing anytime he wants to. That happens to be the present law, and a law that we should keep. This Bill seeks to do just exactly the opposite of that, so that when a judge wants to cut off a probable cause hearing, the attorney could say to him take a look at the Statute, I have the right to subpoena evidence, witnesses, and carry on this hearing as long as I want to. And I also suggest to you that just because a federal court has similar legislation, you cannot, in no way compare the amount of felonies and misdemeanors in the State of Illinois to what the federal courts handle. It's miniscule compared to what we handle in the state courts. I would say to you, that if you pass this law, you're going to tie up your courts beyond belief. Defense attorneys will be able to say that they want evidence from the crime lab and continue the preliminary hearing until they get it. You're going to end up having complete two trials in order to convict someone. This Bill is as...is as we want to say many times, one of the bad Bill's of the Session, and I certainly hope that the House stands reason to defeat this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman. R. Hoffman."

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye',



opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to close."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker...ah...let me point out that...ah...the federal district...federal rules criminal procedure apply to the District of Columbia, and that has all the urban problems the City of Chi... County of Cook has, and all the other urban areas of our state has, and some more I think that we have. And it has all the crimes of violence that our state has, so that it does work in a large urban area, and which has a great crime problem. I think that we have heard...ah...from...ah...a group of prosecutor's, the prosecutorial lobby that is in the House of Representatives, that is always anxious to make it easy for the prosecutor. I've heard how terrible it is that it might help in the discovery of facts for the defendant to defend himself. We've long since got over this concept of adversary proceedings, I think. We're interested in the truth. Sending a man to jail is not a game to be given to the guy with the best lawyer. It is a serious matter. This will help, in fact, bring forth the truth. This will help in the process of finding...ah...defendant's guilty if they are, in fact, guilty. I ask for a favorable vote."

Bradley: "The question is shall Senate Bill 101 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that in its present form, the Bill could further complicate the problem that exist with reference to speedy trials. Ah...the Sponsor indicates that when probable cause has been reached, that the judge at that point would be free to turn off the spigot and adjourn the proceedings. There is, however, nothing in the Bill that does so, and I am very much concerned that the absence of this could...could convert the preliminary hearing into the interminable proceeding that a trial now is. I believe that the Bill ought to be taken back to Second Reading and should spell out the fact that when the judge has determined probable cause that the proceeding may then be closed. I am also concerned about the giving of subpoena with reference to this. I am concerned about the fact that a rape victim can be subpoenaed in and that other people can be, and I'm not aware of any deficiencies in the present





situation in Illinois that would justify that risk and accordingly, I will be voting 'no'."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer, to explain his vote."

Meyer: "I'd just like to point out to the Members of the House that this is the fifth Bill that Judiciary II has let out that's had more than 115 'no' votes against it."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, wish to explain his vote?"

Rayson: "Ah.... I wanted to explain it earlier, but at this late date I won't explain it, but I do...."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "You know, I don't want to burden the House, but I would point out that we've already passed this Bill out as House Bill 63, which Brian Duff sponsored, so that this bad, bad Bill is probably going to be law anyhow."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Fleck: "I'd like to further point out that that Bill we passed out was killed in the Senate when they saw the light."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 19 'ayes', 122 'nos', 8 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 3..... is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 284."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 284. Beatty. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Local Government Tax Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is the Bill to fund the Local Tax Study Commission, the Bill we passed yesterday. This Commission is necessitated in the sense by the new Constitution of 1970 which indicated that source had to be found to replace personal property tax. Ah.... I ask for a favorable vote."

Bradley: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 284 pass? All those in favor, will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all



voted who wished? Shea 'aye'. Bradley 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 134 'ayes', 8 'nos', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 314. Mr. Tipsword."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 314. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that provides the Department of Conservation in acquiring property for state parks and for state memorials, can acquire the property from a willing grantor, permitting the grantor to retain not in excess of three acres as a reserved life estate solely and only for himself, for his own residential purposes and nontransferable to anyone else. I move for the adoption, for the passage of Senate bill 314."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 314 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Maragos 'aye'. On this question, there are 145 'ayes', 1 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Ebbesen 'aye'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 345. Mr. Taylor back there."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 345. Taylor. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, take that Bill out of the Record, please."

Bradley: "Take it out of the Record. Senate Bill 362. Mr. Fennessey."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 362. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 362 empowers the Department of Agriculture to establish trust funds and bank accounts to handle funds in connection with shows promoting Illinois Agricultural activities. It also permits the control and establishment



of funds for bonds for the Director of Agriculture acting as trustee of a discontinued or solvent business, and requires the Department to set rules and records regarding his actions as trustee. There was one Amendment offered to this Bill that increased the salary of the Superintendent of Meat, Poultry and Livestock inspection from \$25,000 to \$30,000. I ask for a favorable Roll Call. The question is shall Senate Bill 362 pass? All those in favor will signify by .....

..... the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill because of the Amendment, increasing the salary of Inspector of Meat, Poultry and Livestock from \$25,000 to \$30,000. I serve on the Agricultural Committee, and there's been a lot of consternation about what's been happening in that Department .....

..... in that Division of the Department of Agriculture, and there's been a lot of disgruntled people ah..... out there in the general public who've had difficulty with this Division, and I see no reason at this time to raise the salary of the head of that Division from \$25,000 to \$30,000, so I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill unless that Amendment is taken off."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor of the Bill did talk to me about an Amendment to an Agricultural Bill, but I would like a ruling from the Chair as far as the Amendment and whether it is attached properly to the Bill, because according to ah..... as I read Senate Bill 362, it amends the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois as far as the Department of Agriculture, but it ah..... which is a substance Bill, and now with House Amendment #1, it's an Appropriation Bill as well and I'd like to know if the Amendment is germane to Senate Bill 362?"

Bradley: "In the opinion of the Chair, your question is not timely. We're on Third Reading and ah..... the Amendment has already been attached and your question is simply not timely, Sir."

Lechowicz: "All right, then, may I ask..... address myself to the Bill itself?"

Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."



Lechowicz: "I noticed that the Bill requests the Department of Agriculture to establish a trust fund and bank accounts in connection with shows for the Illinois Agricultural activities. How many special accounts or trust funds does the Department intend to establish?"

Bradley: "Are you asking the Gentleman a question, Sir?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, I am."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Fennessey: "It's my understanding that they would establish just one, and the reason they want to establish this is because they're private funds given to the Department to promote those shows, and ah.... at the present time, at the end of the year, if those funds have anything they have to go back into the General fund. In this Bill, they'd be allowed to keep them."

Lechowicz: "Well, if the answer is one, why is it in the plural?"

Fennessey: "Well, I can't answer that, Mr. Lechowicz. It does allow them to establish a fund for the bonds that are paid when an elevator or warehouse becomes insolvent and the bonds are turned over to the Department."

Lechowicz: "And what does Senate Amendment #1 do?"

Fennessey: "Senate Amendment #1?"

Lechowicz: "Would you be so kind to pull this out of the Record so...."

Bradley: "Take this out of the Record. Senate Bill 410. Take it out of the Record at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 417."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 417. A Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health Code. Third Reading."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to ask leave to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of several Amendments."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return the Bill to Second Reading? Hearing no objections, Second Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Beaupre. Amend Senate Bill 417, on page 4 by inserting after line 33 the following...."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.... Amendment



#1 is an Amendment to include in certain sections of the Mental Health Code, which inadvertently was omitted from ah... the Senate Amendment that was placed on this Bill. Basically the Amendment provides for monthly payments by the Department of Mental Health to those agencies or firms which are ah.... ah.... outside care facilities and who are housing these patients. It also ah.... allows, says that the Department may collect from the ah.... patients own funds if they are available for those monthly, or for that boarding out of patients. In addition, it provides that the Department of Mental Health may ah.... must utilize monthly visits to ah... the ah.... patient care facility to determine the social, recreational and environmental aspects of housing that patient. It also includes the procedure for investigating complaints ah.... by either patients or relatives or other persons who have an interest in the patient in the ah... mental health facility, and I would ask for your favorable support of the Amendment."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Grotberg: "Representative Beaupre, is Senate Amendment #1 now the Bill?"

Beaupre: "Ah.... I'm not sure whether they struck everything after the enacting clause."

Grotberg: "In reading the synopsis, it's all very familiar to me from all the Committee hearings, but it looks like Senate Amendment #1 is now the Bill where they have to have an individual plan for each patient."

Beaupre: "That's correct."

Grotberg: "Now are you.... is your House Amendment #1 that you're proposing now ah... striking it all over again and incorporating all the things that you said or is it adding on to Senate Amendment #1?"

Beaupre: "No, if you look in the Mental Health Code, there were 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 paragraphs of the Mental Health Code which are already provisions in the law, which were inadvertently omitted in Senate Amendment #1 and they deal with those matters which I have expressed."

Grotberg: "And you're restoring them?"

Beaupre: "Yes, that's correct."



Grotberg: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Further questions? The Gentleman offers Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 417. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Beaupre. Amends Senate Bill 417 on page 1, line 2....."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 deals with the situation where a person has been formally admitted himself. The Bill itself provides that parents and relatives must be notified at least 30 days in advance of moving a patient from one mental health facility to another. In order to make this not apply to persons who informally admit themselves, maybe for a day or so, Senate Amendment, or Amendment #2 is being offered. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Bradley: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 417. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

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

Beaupre: "Yes."

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Borchers: "Well, I would like to make one suggestion due to a happening in our area. I am in full support of what you're doing, but I think you should include when a person has been transferred from a State facility to a nursing home that then the Amendment for the 15 days notice should also apply from one nursing home to another nursing home, and I wonder if you would perhaps do that, and then add that to either the first amendment or the second amendment if you agree with that."

Beaupre: "I agree with that, Representative Borchers. In fact, it was my understanding that any movement of the patient during a course of the first year of their ah... tenancy in a mental institution applied, and that would include moving from one ah.... patient care facility, private patient care facility to another. If that is not what the Bill does, I'd be very happy to entertain an Amend-  
ment."



Borchers: "Well, I'd like to be sure of that point, because as I say a very unfortunate incident that I am aware of."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves....."

Beaupre: "I'd be happy to look over the ah.... to carefully scrutinize the Bill with you."

Bradley: "You wish to take it out of the Record, then?"

Beaupre: "No."

Bradley: "All right, then, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 417. All in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3....."

Beaupre: "Amendment #3, is much like Amendment #2, which deals with the situation of voluntary admission. Ah.... rather than informal admission, and I would move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Bradley: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 417. All in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Beaupre. Amends Senate Bill 417 on page 4, by inserting after line 33....."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 does exactly the same as Amendment #1 and I would move to Table Amendment #4."

Bradley: "Gentleman moves to Table Amendment #4. Hearing no objection the Amendment is Tabled. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Bradley: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 425. Gene Hoffman."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 425. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 435 ah.... makes it possible for special education joint agreements to to the same thing that ah.... vocational and technical joint agreements can do now and also ah.... we've made it possible for schools to ah.... issue bonds against their levy for the life safety code. The synopsis in the Digest is accurate. It authorizes ah.... school



districts to issue bonds against the existing levy which is included in Section 17-2.2a, which allows an eight year levy for capital improvements, two cents for dual districts, four cents for unit districts for capital improvements. Building costs escalating as you know very, very rapidly and this will give the school district the authority to use this money in a joint venture to bond against their levy which presently exists for a special education capital improvement. There's nothing authorized for operations. It's strictly for building purposes. We don't change the levy. We don't change the level of taxation. All we do in this Bill is say that you may bond against the two cent levy that you have and what that's going to bring in, and so I would ah.... ask your support of Senate Bill 425. We put an Amendment on it yesterday, which made it very, very clear, that in all sections of the Bill that we were saying that the levy could not exceed that which already exists under 17-2.2a and I would ask for your support."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Schraeder: "According to the digest and he said it's correct and I want to make sure that this gives the school district authority to levy an additional tax. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "No, it gives them the authority to issue bonds against a tax levy, an authority that they already have."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "There's no new levy."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question. I hope this hasn't been answered. My ear was just being bent and I was trying to listen to this debate."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Tipword: "What are the referendum provisions in this Bill?"

Hoffman: "The ah.... there is no change in the tax levy and the law now, Section 17-2.2a, a dual district can levy four cents for a period of eight years. Pardon me, a unit district can levy four





cents for a period of eight years. A dual district can levy two cents for a period of eight years. This Bill allows them to bond against that levy just as we do now in the Life Safety Code and just as we do now for area vocational centers. There's no increase."

Tipsword: "It's a bond issue without referendum?"

Hoffman: "It's a bond..... It's the issuance of a bond against the tax that they already have the authority to levy. There is no new authority involved in this at all. In other words, it gives the school board the right, if they wish to do so, to issue bonds against a levy that they already have, or the authority that they already have."

Tipsword: "As you're well aware, I'm very uninitiated in school law.

With regard to this tax that you say they can already levy, what is it authorized for other than these bonds?"

Hoffman: "It is authorized, it is currently authorized for the building for or capital improvements for special education. Period. The bonds must be levied for the same..... or must be issued for the same purpose and not to exceed the existing authority."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from ..... the question is, shall Senate Bill 425 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Bradley 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Berman 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Capuzi 'aye'. McDonald 'aye'. The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 131 'ayes', 7 'nos', 4 voting 'present' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 438."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 438. A Bill for an Act to create the Commission on Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 438 creates a Commission on Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. It is a consolidation Bill. This Bill will be placed in the Mental Health Planning Board, the Board of Mental Health Commissioners, the Mental Health Advisory Committee, and the Commission



on Mental Health. It will have a 19 Member Board, 12 would be Legislative Members, several will be public Members, 4 of whom would be appointed by the Governor and ah.... 3 to be appointed by the Legislative leaders. I ask for your approval on this Bill."

Bradley: "Discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill 438 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those 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 124 'ayes', 5 'nos', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 449. Out of the Record. 452. Mr. Capparelli. Out of the Record. 4.... what purpose does the Gentleman from Madison arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I will attempt again to make, called what is probably is called a futile effort to get us to change our Order of Business."

Bradley: "Mr. Madison, we are going to change the Order of business, I assure you in the not too distant future."

Madison: "Does that mean next week, Mr. Speaker?"

Bradley: "That means this afternoon, Sir."

Madison: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Senate Bill 461."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 461. Sevcik. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Legislative Investigation, Investigating Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman, Mr. Sevcik, is he in the Chambers? Take it out of the Record. Mr. D. L. Houlihan here? Londrigan. Senate Bill 488."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 488. Londrigan. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses in Military and Naval Department. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Appropriation for the Military and Naval Department, and the National Guard and Militia and so forth. It's been cut already, and I would respectfully suggest that we pass this Bill for \$4,328,000."

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



Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill of which I spoke earlier when we were on Second Reading. Our ever vigilant staff has made a very careful study of all of these appropriation Bills pursuant to the Governor's mandate, and we're prepared to show this Body where \$625,000 dollars of fat can be trimmed out of this budget without in any way diminishing or harming the military preparedness of the State of Illinois. Now if we are going to meet, what we must do, to avoid a tax increase, we have to make these reductions. This is not a six percent reduction, it figures out fourteen point two percent. But the figures are there, and the Amendment has been distributed. The Amendment was made and put on immediately upon the course being determined and then we were chagrined to discover that the Bill had already been moved to Third Reading. We went immediately to the very fine Sponsor and said bring it back to Second, that we might do justly here for all the taxpayers. I, again, request the Sponsor to bring the Bill back to Second, so that the Amendment we've offered might be adopted; that the deficit, the hole, the gaping hole in the General Fund might be thereby reduced \$625,000 dollars without pain or harm to anyone. And this is in no way a reflection on General Phipps when he came before the Appropriations Committee, I'm safe in saying that we had not a single witness who made a better impression upon the Appropriation's Committee than he, but it is the evil reality of life that we must make the cut. So we ask that it be brought back to Second respectfully."

Bradley: "The Gentleman to close. If not, the question is...do you wish to close Mr. Londrigan?"

Londrigan: "I would just say in closing, that this Bill has been through both Appropriation Committee's; it's been cut in the final good order and if we're going to bring Bills back and forth constantly, we'll be here to Christmas. So I suggest we get on with the business, and pass this Bill which has got to its final step."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, had his light on and then it was turned off, and that's why I went to him to close. Do you wish to...ah...?"

Gaines: "Yes,...ah...I thought they were going to see to my colleague's admonition, and I have to speak against this Bill. Ah...we're talk-



ing about taking food out of the mouths of children, taking mental health programs away from disturbed people, and yet we want to go to a militaristic hardware Bill, we don't want to have any cuts. Now this doesn't seem fair to me, that when you want to start talking about cutting education, public aid and the mental health programs, yet you don't want to cut where, I'm quite sure, we'd be, where we can defend ourselves. The national government has the primary responsibility of that anyway. So therefore, I urge that this Bill be defeated, so that the Sponsor will then be amenable to the Amendment.

Bradley: "The Gentleman has moved...the question is shall Senate Bill 488 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, and Members of the General Assembly. Representative Cunningham has requested of the Sponsor to do what the Governor has requested and what all of us recognize as a serious Fiscal picture in this State. That is to bring this Bill back to Second Reading, so that the Members of this General Assembly, will have an opportunity to bring this Department or Agency of government within a reasonable fiscal amount. The amount that Representative Cunningham requested was as indicated, \$625,000 dollars. This Bill has been increased...er...this appropriation already has a seven percent increase in it over the Fiscal Year '75 budget. I think the Sponsor owes, not only Representative Cunningham the courtesy of bringing it back to Second Reading, but also owes it to the people of the State of Illinois that we take a good look at this. And I request a 'no' vote."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, the fat that we mentioned in the budget that needs to be removed in February 1, 1975, there were 22 unfilled positions, and yet the National Guard was moving along very nicely. It would save \$157,500 dollars to make that removable. There's \$360,000 dollars to repair the various armories and yet there is a \$800,000 dollar item for armory repair in House Bill 82...ah...802. And it is for that reason that we say to you again, that we say to



you again, that there can be no honest dispute that \$625,000 dollars can be removed and spent for more other urgent needs for the people of the State of Illinois."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to explain his vote. He doesn't wish to explain it."

Lechowicz: "No."

Bradley: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Ah...for those of you who are voting 'yes' on this, I would ask you to stop and reflect for a minute on this appropriation, and consider changing to red. Ah...one of the item's...ah...for which appropriation is being made in this Bill is for the Naval Militia. At one point last year, in connection with duties on the Higher Education Committee, I had occasion to go over and interview a commanding officer of the Naval Militia here in the State of Illinois. And I asked him how many ships the Naval Militia has, and he said, oh...well, we had one once, but that was back in World War II. Now, I submit that to appropriate money for a Naval Militia that doesn't even have a ship is the height of follie and I would suggest that some of those green lights turn to red, we analyzed this budget and this is one place where we can really make a cut."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines to explain his vote."

Gaines: "At the proper time, I would like to ask for a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 95 'ayes', 32 'nos', the Gentleman has asked for a verification of the Roll. The Clerk will call the affirmative Roll. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, arise?"

Katz: "Ah...to be recorded as 'aye', instead of 'present', Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye', instead of 'present'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, arise?"

Caldwell: "Change me from 'present' to 'aye'."

Bradley: "Change the Gentleman from 'present' to 'aye'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania would like to be recorded as 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"



Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'present' to 'no'?"

Bradley: "Mr. Madison from 'present' to 'no'. Proceed with the affirmative Roll Sir. Call the affirmative Roll. "

Selcke: "Arnell."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan, arise?"

Londrigan: "Poll the absentees, please."

Bradley: "A request to poll the absentees. For what purpose does the Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, arise? Mrs. Younge? She wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Poll the absentees."

Selcke: "Bluthardt, Collins, D'Arco, Duff, Fleck, Friedrich, Griesheimer, Ron Hoffman, Kent, Molloy, Palmer, Rayson, Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Telcser, Washington."

Bradley: "Telcser 'present'."

Selcke: "...shington, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Lady from Lake arise? Mrs. Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "Ah...inasmuch as this doesn't...I didn't quite understand it.

I realize that there might be some mistake, but change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', because I believe in a strong National Guard."

Bradley: "Was she recorded as 'no', Mr. Clerk?"

Selcke: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'present'."

Bradley: "Change her vote to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Molloy, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Proceed with calling the affirmative Roll Sir."

Selcke: "That's it. At this time, the count is 100 'ayes', and 34 'nos'."

Bradley: "At this time, we have 100 'ayes' and 34 'nos'. Does the Gentleman persist in his request? He does not...do you persist in your request for verification Sir? There was a hundred 'ayes'. He does persist."

Selcke: "Arnell, Gene Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Birchler, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet,...okay...Byers, D'Arco votes 'aye', Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Capuzi, Chapman, Craig, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, DiPrima, Downs, John Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman,



Hanahan, Hill, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, LaFleur, Laurino, Lechowicz, Lemke, Leon, Leverenz, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Lundy, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, Mautino, McAvoy, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Molloy, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, O'Daniel, Patrick, Pierce, Pouncey, Randolph, Sangmeister."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, arise?"

Rayson: "I was off the Floor at the time, I ask to be recorded 'aye'."

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Mr. Washington wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Continue with the verification."

Selcke: "Rayson."

Bradley: "Mrs. Satterthwaite wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Proceed Sir."

Selcke: "Sangmeister, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, VanDuyne, VonBoeckman, Wall, Washington, White, Williams, Young. Yeah."

Bradley: "Question of the affirmative Roll? Turn on Mr. Schlickman's mike. Question of the affirmative Roll?"

Gaines: "Ah...Beatty?"

Bradley: "Beatty's in his seat."

Gaines: "Beaupre?"

Bradley: "Beaupre on the Floor? How's the Gentleman recorded? Beaupre?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Boyle?"

Bradley: "Representative Boyle on the Floor? How's the Gentleman's recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'. There he is. There he is."

Bradley: "The Gentleman's in the back of the Chambers."

Gaines: "Ah...Brinkmeier?"

Bradley: "Representative Brinkmeier's in his Chair."

Gaines: "Capparelli?"

Bradley: "Representative Capparelli's in his Chair."

Gaines: "Chapman?"



Bradley: "Mrs. Chapman's standing next to her Chair."

Gaines: "D'Arco?"

Bradley: "Representative D'Arco? Representative D'Arco's sitting in the Chambers."

Gaines: "Ewell?"

Bradley: "Well, just a minute now, what about D'Arco? D'Arco's recorded as voting 'aye'. Is the Gentleman in the Chambers? How's he recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Now what was the next one Sir?"

Gaines: "Ewell?"

Bradley: "Representative Ewell? He's in the Chambers?"

Gaines: "No, he isn't."

Bradley: "Yourell is, but not Ewell. How's he recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Put D'Arco back on, he's in the Chambers. Proceed Sir."

Gaines: "Fennessey?"

Bradley: "Representative Fennessey is in his Chair."

Gaines: "Garmisa?"

Bradley: "Garmisa? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Greiman?"

Bradley: "Ah...pardon Sir?"

Gaines: "Greiman."

Bradley: "Greiman. Is Mr. Greiman on the Floor? How's he recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "He's just...here he is in the Chambers, in the hall, doorway."

Gaines: "Ah...Huff?"

Bradley: "Representative Huff? I can't see back there. Is Representative Huff in his Chair? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Ah...Kane? He's back. Katz?"

Bradley: "Pardon?"





Gaines: "Katz?"

Bradley: "Representative Katz? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "He's right here in the side door."

Gaines: "Keller?"

Bradley: "Representative Keller? Representative Keller, is he in the  
Chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Further..."

Gaines: "LaFleur?"

Bradley: "Representative LaFleur? Is the Gentleman in the Chambers?  
How's he recorded?"

Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane,  
for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Kane: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Kane: "Vote me 'present'."

Bradley: "Vote the Gentleman 'present'. Continue with the verification."

Gaines: "Laurino?"

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan wishes to be recorded as voting 'present'."

Selcke: "Hanahan 'aye' to 'present'."

Gaines: "Laurino?"

Bradley: "Laurino? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Ah...Lucco?"

Bradley: "He's in the center aisle. Beaupre is back on the Floor, put  
him back on the Roll."

Gaines: "McAvoy?"

Bradley: "Representative McAvoy, is he in the Chambers? How's the  
Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Put Laurino back on, he's back in the  
Chambers."

Gaines: "Sevcik?"



Bradley: "Representative Sevcik? Is he in the Chambers? How's he recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Sharp?"

Bradley: "Representative Sharp? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off...is he in the Chambers? Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Stubblefield?"

Bradley: "Representative Stubblefield? Is Representative Stubblefield in the Chambers?"

Selcke: "There he is."

Bradley: "Rear of the Chambers."

Gaines: "Geo-Karis?"

Bradley: "Representative Geo-Karis? Is she in the Chambers? How is she recorded?"

Selcke: "The Lady's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take her off the Roll."

Gaines: "VonBoeckman?"

Bradley: "Representative VonBoeckman? Is Representative VonBoeckman in his seat? I can't see the...how's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Representative White?"

Bradley: "Representative White? Representative White in the Chambers? How's he recorded?"

Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Gaines: "Representative Hill?"

Bradley: "Representative Hill's in his Chair. Representative Geo-Karis has returned, Representative Keller has returned."

Gaines: "Representative Mahar?"

Bradley: "Representative Mahar? He's in the rear of the Chambers Sir."

Gaines: "Okay....."

Bradley: "Clerk, what...ah...the count? Mr. White requests that he be returned to the Roll as an 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr.



Palmer, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Palmer: "How am I recorded?"

Bradley: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Selcke: "Absent."

Palmer: "Vote me present, please."

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting present. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 34 'nayes', 29 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby, Porter 'aye', this...96 'ayes', 95 'ayes', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Collins 'aye'. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 33 'nayes' 25...ah...29 voting 'present', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 486."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 486. An Act to amend the Administrative Review Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, D. L.."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 486 amends the Administrative Review Act. This Bill is permissive legislation which would enable local units of government to provide that judicial review of final decisions of an administrative agency of a unit of local government may be pursuant to the terms of the Administrative Review Act. The Bill provides that a unit of local government may adopt the provisions of the Administrative Review Act to govern the appeal from decisions of its administrative agencies by enacting an ordinance expressly so providing. As amended there is a notice provision included requiring the administrative agency to inform the parties that review shall be pursuant to the Administrative Review Act. The effect of this legislation would be to place administrative agencies created by local ordinance on the same footing as far as opting to use the Administrative Review Act as state agencies or local agencies created by a specific State Statute. This is permissive legislation and it would be up to the local units of government to implement it, and I urge your support of the Bill."

Bradley: "Discussion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian. Would the Gentlemen in front of Mr. Mugalian please sit down."



Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor or my office mate yield to a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Representative Houlihan, how many units of local government are there in Illinois that would be affected by this legislation? Do you have any idea?"

Houlihan: "It would affect all units of local government in Illinois."

Mugalian: "That includes school districts?"

Houlihan: "That is correct."

Mugalian: "How many administrative proceedings now affecting local government are subjected by present State Statutes to the Administrative Review Act? Now, I know that's a very..... I wouldn't have the answer to that either."

Houlihan: "It's almost an impossible question to answer, Dick. Ah...."

Mugalian: "Would you indicate some of the areas in which they are subject to the review Act?"

Houlihan: "Well, first of all, the Administrative Review Statute provides that reviews shall be pursuant to the terms of the Administrative Review Act, where the Statute creating the agency expressly provides that the Administrative Review Act shall govern. For example, ah... take a situation, the common situation of the zoning board appeals of a local municipality which is created under the enabling legislation in Chapter 24 of the Cities and Villages Act. A Zoning Board of Appeal created by local ordinance pursuant to that enabling legislation. Under that enabling legislation, review of those zoning board of appeals is pursuant to the terms of the Administrative Review Act."

Mugalian: "May I speak to the Bill?"

Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Mugalian: "I hope I can have some order, because I think this is a very important Bill."

Bradley: "Can we give the Gentleman some order please?"

Mugalian: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, some of the more important Bills that come before us do not require tax monies, do not impose criminal sanction, do not prescribe a standard of business or social behavior, do not affect consumer prices or standards of service and



so forth, but this is a Bill which I'm sure very few Members have had experience with, or with the subject with which it deals. Something called administrative review. If adoption will affect the entire citizenry of this State, all of your constituents, in my opinion it will be unfair to them, especially those who are sometimes called little people. It deals with City Hall, and by City Hall, I refer to all of our local units of government. It deals with officialdom, and the citizens position is officialdom. You've heard the expression 'why fight City Hall'. This Bill would make it even more difficult for our citizens to obtain redress or services or privileges from the thousands of cities and villages, school districts, parks, all units of local government. There are hundreds of different situations where a local administrative agency or official makes a decision. Let me give one illustration. A citizen asks for a building permit to add a porch to his home. But first, let me give a few other examples. A license to operate a corner hotdog stand; a zoning variation, say a two foot side yard variation; a park employee disciplinary or suspension hearing or a permit, just merely a permit to close a street in a subdivision for a 4th of July celebration, or for a block party. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, these illustrations are relatively small matters, but I can give illustrations of administrative action on the local level that will be affected by this Bill that could involve ones livelihood, his job, or a project involving millions of dollars. Now the normal rule is, if your application for a building permit is rejected by the building commissioner, you can go to court. That's the normal rule. If this Bill passes, and a Village adopts the permissive ordinance under this Bill, making the matter subject to administrative review, here's what happens. Say the Commissioner rejects your application, you can still go to court, yes, but you can't call witnesses. All you get is a review of the records that was made of the hearing before the building commission. I thought we had ten minutes to speak on a Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Mugalian: "If the court decides that the commissioner's decision is not against the manifest weight of the evidence, you're all through. Now



how many people would you know that would know that when they go before the building commissioner or any lowly official of the village or the park board or the school district, that that hearing is the entire ball game? How many people would know that at that level of request for relief you must hire a lawyer, get witnesses and be sure there is a court reporter? Most people would walk in alone and tell the commissioner they want a permit and why. Many lawyers may not know either. Let's say a lawyer was first hired by someone if this law became law, this Bill became law, he couldn't check the Illinois Statutes to check to see if there were an administrative review situation in that municipality. He'd have to go to each Village or township or high school district to find out if they passed an ordinance adopting the provisions of this Bill. Who is between the City and the citizen, would be in the position of knowing how the game is played? Which party would know enough to prove all the elements of the case at the first local hearing? Which party would have legal counsel available? Which party would have all the resources the taxpayer provides? Where is all the expertise and experience? Our citizens, I submit Ladies and Gentlemen, should have the opportunity to have a simple request or application or redress considered on an informal preliminary basis. They should not have to fear the worst or spend money for lawyers in order to build a porch addition."

Bradley: "Would the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close, please?"

Mugalian: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Should not have to unless the legislature provides for each particular situation which is the law now. It's already too tough to go fight city hall. Let's not completely close the door on our citizenry."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm afraid the previous speaker has almost completely missed what the effect of the Bill is. We are not, in any sense, talking about a prohibition on the introduction of evidence before an administrative agency. What we are talking about, and talking about solely, is a method of review of a final decision of an administrative agency. Now if we are concerned about the little people, then I would emphasize to you that this method of judicial review is a lot less



costly than the institution of a completely new judicial proceeding in order to review the judgement of an Administrative Agency. Additionally, it is much less costly, it is much more expeditious, because the court at this point will be reviewing the records, but there is no prohibition on the introduction of evidence. Finally, this is permissive legislation. It is up to the local units of government when they create their administrative agencies to opt for, appeal by waive administrative review. It would put those agencies on the same footing as State agencies who are subject to the act and local agencies that have been created by a specific State Statute. This is all it is, is a method of review, and the alternative is, if you don't have review along these lines, you're going to have to institute a.... either a suit for declaratory judgement. You're going to have duplication on the costs of witnesses. You go to a trial, in the Circuit Court, and I submit that it's time consuming and very expensive when most of the matters which are considered by this administrative agency are relatively mundane matters; a back porch for example. A rear yard or a side yard variation, that we are relying for in the first instance and the determination of the administration aides and because of the expertise of the agencies. I'm emphasizing it is permissive legislation and I urge your support of the Bill."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 486 pass? All those in favor, will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly, I have the highest personal regards for the House Sponsor of this Bill. I speak from years of experience as a municipal attorney. This is a trap that will be set for all the citizens of our State. I don't know if all of you heard ah..... my remarks. There was a lot of hub-bub around, but I wish you would think very carefully about the consequences of this Bill and of your very, very, important Bill. As I say, this involves something called administrative review, which most lawyers don't know much about, much less the common citizenry. We can entrap our citizens into going before a local governmental unit for something relatively unimportant and then find that when they go to Court, they've



been stuck because they didn't know how to proceed and didn't realize that they had to make a complete legal case in order to get relief."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, to explain his vote."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was described by the Sponsor as a permissive Bill and indeed it is. It is permissive to the Unit of Local Governments. It's not permissive, though, to the individual and I wonder why, if we're going to change the method of reviewing municipalities and agencies decisions, why we can't give that right to the individual rather than to the municipality and let them decide what way they want to have the review taken, either under the administrative review act or on a trial. I would urge a 'no' vote. I think this is a very bad Bill."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Pardon me, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Frederick, you wish to explain your vote, Sir?"

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure where you're going to find enough judges to hear these ah..... things that if somebody gets tagged off of first base on a building permit or something. I think you're creating another monster."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Borchers 'aye'. On this question, there are 96 'ayes', 57 'nos', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 512."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 512. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Civil Defense Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker....."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, arise?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to make a request of the Sponsor, in a timely way if I might. He's asking to make some copies of some material which is out being copied right now relative to this Bill, and I wonder if the Sponsor would be willing to take it out of the Record until we have an opportunity to give him that material and allow him to talk to the Director?"





Bradley: "Mr. Maragos, do you wish to respond, Sir?"

Maragos: "What does he ..... Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I understand that this Amendment, that they want to propose was in their hands over two or three days, and I just got wind of this five minutes ago, and I tried to get in touch with the Director of this ah..... of this Department and I can't. But anyway, in good conscious, cannot find him this afternoon. In order to give this thing the thought that it needs, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will not wait for any Amendments and I would ask that the Appropriation be approved as is."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from MacCoupin, Mr. Boyle, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Boyle: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Boyle: "All right, now we've been on Second Reading, we've been on Senate Bills. Now, I concur with Representative Madison. There are a number of House Bills left on this Calendar that are going to be in jeopardy. Some of them are on Third Reading and they have to go back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment, and I would ..... you assured the Gentleman, Representative Madison, that we would go to these House Bills and that was some time ago, and I would urge the Speaker, at this time, to keep his commitment and get to these House Bills."

Bradley: "Sir, we're going to go to House Bills very shortly. Proceed, Mr. Maragos, on Senate Bill 512."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is the Appropriation that has been going to both Houses..... and I would like to state that....."

Bradley: "Mr. Maragos. Mr. Maragos, pardon me for a minute. Mr. Duff, again, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I apologize, but I was going to respond to Representative Maragos, when Representative Boyle interrupted."

Bradley: "Well, Sir, you ask the question to take it out of the Record. He said he wouldn't do it, so we proceed with the Bill, Sir."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on the fact that this Amendment, contrary to Representative Maragos' statement....."



Bradley: "We're not on the Amendments, Sir."

Duff: "Was printed yesterday and is on the desks, and ah.... he now has the data that he asked me to duplicate for him, and I would appreciate it if he would consider it. It's a significant matter in keeping with the request of the Governor. Ah..... and it's not going to be difficult. There's a lot of merit to it, and perhaps we could save a lot of time of the House if he would take it out of the Record and discuss it with us. He did say he wanted to talk to the Director."

Bradley: "Sir, I think you're out of order, and I hate to say that to you, but he's already said that he wants to proceed with his Bill and it's his Bill, so Mr. Maragos, on the Bill. Proceed, Sir."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to state that this is the Office of Civil Defense and I kind of feel very bad, but five minutes before the Bill is suppose to be called up here to be .... given.... to make a decision, whether I should call it at this time or take an Amendment that they want to put on. And I think it's bad policy on anybody's part. They knew what they wanted to do a long time ago. Therefore, this has gone through both the Senate Committee and the House Appropriations Committee. The staff recommendations are that they should not be touched, because if we need in certain areas of civil disaster, we have to have these funds available. Therefore, I move its adoption for its passage."

Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise again in opposition to the procedure that's being followed by the Democratic Party. You are going to be responsible for the actions that this General Assembly is taking by not going along with the cuts in revenue that the Republican Party is proposing. We have asked only the courtesy that we bring these Bills back with a look at the revenue picture that we have today. You are going to be the ones responsible for an income tax increase or sales tax increase and I don't think you want it anymore than we do. It's about time you sit down with us and look at this Amendments."

Bradley: "For what purpose..... pardon me, Sir. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, arise?"



Beatty: "A Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Beatty: "Man is giving a political speech. He's not talking to the Bill.  
I suggest he confine his remarks to the Bill or....."

Bradley: "Your point is well taken. Mr. Totten, will you confine your  
remarks to Senate Bill 512, please?"

Totten: "Thank you. That's what I was doing, Mr. Speaker, because let me  
point out that the decision on what we're going to do on taxes to  
meet the budget that the Democratic Party is trying to force on the  
People of this State is going to be a whopping political decision,  
when you have to vote for an income tax increase."

Bradley: "Sir, I don't think there's anything about income tax in Senate  
Bill 512. Would you please proceed on 512?"

Totten: "Again Mr. Speaker, we've asked for the courtesy to bring it back  
to Second Reading so that we can have a shot at an Amendment. I think  
that courtesy is only due us, and I'd ask the Members of this  
General Assembly to vote 'present' or 'no' on this Bill until we have  
that courtesy."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 512 pass? The Gentleman from  
Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

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

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Ryan: "Representative Maragos, has this Bill been amended?"

Maragos: "It was amended in the Senate."

Ryan: "Can you tell me what the Amendment does?"

Maragos: "Mr. Ryan, you're a Member of the Appropriations Committee, you  
have enough staff and you know what it does. I'm a little perturbed  
at your dilatory tactics."

Ryan: "What's dilatory about asking you a question about the Bill,  
Representative Maragos?"

Maragos: "Well, you know the answer's dilatory, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "No, I don't know it's dilatory. If the Amendment's dilatory, you're  
telling me that, then I have a better idea of how to vote."

Bradley: "Let's have some order in debate. The Gentleman wishes to respond  
he can. If he doesn't want to, we'll proceed. You wish to reply,  
Mr. Maragos."



Maragos: "The Amendment, Mr..... If you read the Digest, Mr. Ryan, it provides that no funds appropriated may be expended in violation of the rules and regulations of the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Committee, which is adopted."

Ryan: "That's the only Amendment on this Bill?"

Maragos: "That's correct, Sir."

Ryan: "And there's no reduction at all in this Bill?"

Maragos: "No, in fact, Mr. Ryan, both your staff and the staff of the Democratic side have recommended that this Bill come through in the form that it came, because we discussed that."

Ryan: "Well, it's too bad that they don't have a vote on this Floor, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "No, but they've studied it more than you evidently."

Ryan: "Well, I doubt that, and certainly if you feel that this has got a dilatory amendment on it, I would encourage the Members of the House not to vote for any Bill with a dilatory Amendment on it and again, ah.... I think that the Ladies and Gentlemen of this House should be reminded of their constitutional responsibilities. We're about to pass Bills, or have passed Bills and we're going to continue it looks like, based on the will of the Democrat majority, that we're going to spend more money than we're going to take in, Ladies and Gentlemen, and that is a violation of our oath of office according to the Constitution. So you vote your will and do what you have to do here. I recommend a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, wish recognition, and will the Gentleman please sit down that's standing in front of him."

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

Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Telcser: "Representative Maragos, I want you to tell me why you won't support your Governor's effort to cut down the excessive State spending?"

Maragos: "Mr. Telcser, I have received no word from the Governor, nor from the Director of this Department that they want their Bill amended and as a result of the last minute approach by the Leadership on your to take an Amendment, which has not been given to me to study nor the the Department head to study, I think is a smack of just politics



and not in a constructive manner."

Telcser: "Representative Maragos, didn't you hear the Governor's last minute speech on Wednesday night? "

Bradley: "Mr. Telcser, Mr. Telcser, would you please confine your remarks to Senate Bill 512? That is what we recognized you for, Sir? You wish to proceed? If not, Mr. Duff, the Gentleman from Cook."

Duff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, if I may address it."

Bradley: "Just a minute, Sir. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, on a Point of Order."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Gentleman from upstate has already spoken on 512."

Bradley: "No, Sir, he hasn't been recognized to speak on the Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have not addressed the Bill."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker he did..... Point of Order. I..... Mr. Duff did already interrogate me and he had his opportunity to speak on the Bill."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken on the Bill and I would like to."

Bradley: "Mr. Duff, would you wait just one minute please. We recognized the fact, Sir, that you have not spoken on the Bill. You don't have to take the place of the Chair. Now we will allow you to go ahead and speak on the Bill, Sir. We like to be fair to both sides of the aisle."

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since 1968, every year, there has been an appropriation made, ah..... for the Governor's disaster release fund of one million dollars. In 1968, these expenditures were \$760,000. Since then they have never been that large. In 1969, it was \$93,000. In 1970, \$714,000. In 1971, \$74,000. In 1972, \$272,000. 1973, \$688,000. 1974, \$444,000 and as of May 31, 1975, out of this fund, there has only been an expenditure of \$111,000. This Bill calls for an appropriation of one million dollars. Now the controller of the agency in his report to the Commission made a statement that all of the releases were not properly written in. The total amount of the release, he says, was not used. The totals, he says, are shown in order to substantiate the one million dollar appropriation. In other



words, the control of the agency going before the appro..... to the ah... in his report to the ah.... staff director of the Department of the Budget admitted that he had "plussed" up the figures in order to reach a one million dollar appropriation. Now what I'm saying to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, is that here we have a perfect example of a Bill with a one million dollar appropriation for which there is absolutely no justification over a ten year history, and where this year's expenditures are indicating it will be considerably lower even in the normal average. All I would like to do in this respect is suggest to the House that if you ever wanted to follow your Governor's advice and cut your budget on a legitimate basis, here is an absolutely impeccable example of how we could cut \$300,000 out of the budget with no difficulty whatsoever. All it would require is a little bit of courtesy on the part of the Sponsor to bring the Bill back to Second and in lieu of that not happening, I think we would be remiss in our obligations to even consider voting 'aye' on this Bill. The more 'present' votes you can see up there, the more protest you can have to this fight that we can't control between the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor of Illinois. Now go ahead and fight, fellows, but the People are bleeding while you're doing it."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I would move the previous question."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Maragos to close..... Do six Members wish a Roll Call? The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. The opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 92 'ayes', 57 'nos' and this..... The Motion failed, Sir. Back to the debate. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster. On Senate Bill 512."

Deuster: "Ah..... Yes, in speaking on this Bill, one of the questions that has come up is the dilitory ah.... idea of considering an Amendment to a Senate Bill. I don't know what happened.... and I might say this, I would like to share this experience quickly with some of you



Members. This morning, we sent about four Committee Bills from the House over to the Senate. They're all sent down the tube, and I think the least we can do....."

Bradley: "Pardon me, Sir. Mr. Deuster. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, on a Point of Order."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, my Point of Order is that the Bill is on Third Reading and it should be voted up or down. It's passed the Second Reading stage on Amendments."

Bradley: "Your point is well taken. Mr. Deuster, on the Bill, on Third Reading."

Deuster: "Representative Lechowicz' point is well taken and we should vote this down and take it back for an Amendment on Second Reading and I urge many 'no' votes."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, on the Bill."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again we have a choice of guns or butter and unlike the other Bill we mustn't come down on the side of God. There must be a priority in our expenditures. Article VIII, Section 2 provides the proposed expenditures shall not exceed funds estimated to be available. That's the Constitutional Rule under which we operate. We have been informed and we believe that there's not enough money to go around. Civil Defense is a fine program. We all believe in it, but somewhere we have to make the cut. The thing that you have to ask yourselves, right here and now, is do you want to take it away from the schools, do you want to take it away from Mental Health, do you want to take it away from public assistance, or do you want to take it away from where it will hurt the least to all the people of the State of Illinois. Your conscious should tell you in this instance, Ladies and Gentleman, that the right vote is 'no'. No, that we might make the reductions that we say we can make. We have the figures. We can put the budget in balance. Give us a chance to prove that we can do so. Take it back to Second so we can amend it. You have to vote 'no', is the first step to that simple progress that we would outline to you."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. Just a few



days ago, we had the Governor come before us with the ridiculous speech by asking us to cut six percent across the board in all the budgets. I hear shouts for a Point of Order....."

Bradley: "Sir, will you keep your remarks....."

Collins: "And I think this is directly to the Bill, because I think this Bill should be turned down, because we have to make cuts somewhere and this is a good place to start. Now, the alternative offered by the other side of the aisle, I submit, is equally ridiculous as the Governor's, because of making an across the board cut, they suggest that we make no cuts. Now, somewhere this has got to start. We know that this Budget can stand some substantial cuts and we know that this Bill is one that can very easily stand cuts, and we should, we should address ourselves to the problem of our fiscal responsibilities in this State, and this is the place to start....."

Bradley: "Mr. Collins..... Mr. Collins will you kindly..... Mr. Collins confine your remarks to the Senate Bill, will you, Sir, please?"

Collins: "I am confining my remarks to this Bill that we should defeat, because once we defeat this Bill, then we can come up with a reasonable approach to civil defense as we should to all the budgets in this record budget that is proposed by the Governor, which now he apologizes for and asks us to cut across the board."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from....."

Collins: "We can make selective cuts and this is certainly one that can be most selective."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from....."

Collins: "Do I have ten minutes or not?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook.... Are you through, Sir?"

Collins: "No, I'm not."

Bradley: "Will you please proceed on the Bill now?"

Collins: "Well, how much of my ten minutes do I have, Sir?"

Bradley: "We're not keeping the clock on you. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos....."

Collins: "Well, if you're not keeping the clock on me, then I have ten minutes from now, so if you don't mind, I'll start all over again, Sir."





Bradley: "You've got ten minutes on the Bill, because you haven't spoke on it yet."

Collins: "Well, that seems to be a matter of ah.... which side of the aisle you sit on, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest to you...."

Bradley: "Would you please bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Collins: "I would suggest to you, in an approach to this Bill, the Sponsor was asked a very reasonable request to take it back and he said he couldn't because he didn't see the Amendments that were offered to this Bill. Well, I submit to you that we didn't see any suggestions by the Governor of this State as to what cuts we should make in these budgets, rather than an outlandish suggestion of six percent....."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, on a Point of Order."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order. I think that there's been remarks made earlier that this is not the proper time for Amendments. They should have been in by now. We should ah... talk to the Bill as it is presently formed and make a decision on that Bill now. The Governor's gone on Record supplying us with a recommendation on an across the board cut and he'll make those cuts if we don't make them now. In order to proceed with business, I suggest that we move this Bill in the form that it's in presently."

Bradley: "Your remarks are well taken, Sir. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of Parliamentary Inquiry. All right, now, the previous speaker from Peoria got up here, making a political speech on a point of order that had nothing to do with what the issue Mr. Collins was addressing himself, and I think to allow the Chair to interrupt a distinguished Representative like Mr. Collins from using his Constitutional right in explaining the merits and demerits of this legislation is a disgrace to the Assembly."

Bradley: "Mr. Simms, the Chair can recognize and must recognize a Member on a Point of Order, Sir, and I did not know what his point was, but we have to do that and you fully recognize that. Now is Mr. Collins through? Would you please bring your remarks to a close, because you've only got 30 seconds left on Senate Bill 512."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, the timer isn't on or the light would have shown me the yellow light. However, anyone that knows me knows that I wouldn't



be making a political speech here. I'm speaking just to the Bill, and I will thank Mr. Simms in rising in my defense. Ah.... obviously, Mr. Mudd's remarks were out of order despite your ruling, because I'm not offering an Amendment to the Bill. I am speaking on a Bill and for anybody to suggest that these factors are dilatory, I suggest to you that flushing Bills like this one, are dilatory because obviously we're going to be back here in special session trying to figure out how to pay for this record bare-breaking budget of which this Senate Bill, Senate Bill 512, is an integral part, so I suggest once again, Mr. Speaker, and I implore and urge every Member of the House, let's vote 'no' or 'present' on this Bill so we can come up with a reasonable civil defense budget, one that we can live with, one the People of Illinois can live with, and one that will not result in a tax increase, and one maybe we can responsibly approach this problem and do as the Governor of the State of Illinois has suggested and bring some sanity to this Budget that he now apologizes for projecting to the People of the State of Illinois, and I thank you for your indulgence."

Bradley: "The Chair would like to proceed with Mr. Collins' suggestion and take the roll. If there's no further debate..... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I think the issue is clear, and I would move the previous question."

Bradley: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor, will say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The ..... Representative Maragos, to close."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at this time, I would like to proceed....."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, arise?"

Duff: "Well, now, Mr. Speaker, Representative Gaines, from the very beginning of this debate, has been trying to be recognized. There was a clear question as to whether the two-thirds majority on that oral roll call. Twelve Members on this side of the aisle have put up their hands in accordance with the Rules to ask for a roll call. I think Representative Gaines has a right to be heard and we have the right to a roll call."



Bradley: "We don't want to ah.... eliminate anybody from discussion.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, on the Bill. If it's not on the Bill, we're going to rule them out of order and proceed."

Gaines: "Well, I think that the Bill has to do with civil defense, is that right, Mr. Speaker?"

Bradley: "Speak to the Bill, Sir."

Gaines: "It has to do with the Civil Defense budget, is that correct? Is that the correct subject matter?"

Bradley: "You'll proceed with your remarks and we'll see, Sir."

Gaines: "All right. Now, Civil Defense, we suppose that there's going to be some kind of complications and it appears to me there would be Congress taking the war making powers away from the President. That that has been reduced. With the aid to the war in the Far East, that has been reduced. Therefore, I don't know why we need to increase a budget for something that we have a decreased need for. That's number one. I think that's germane, Mr. Chair."

Bradley: "We'll let you know when it's not, Sir."

Gaines: "And also, I want to know where they've been. I've never seen them in my neighborhood. I don't know if they have any offices in my neighborhood, and I think I belong to everything in my neighborhood, and never heard of them, and ah.... I think it's disgraceful that the Democratic side of the aisle ran through Bills that don't benefit the black community, and that's where they get their votes from, and I think that you ought to think about that, because I'm going to tell you that you vote for military hardware against butter, and I think it's a disgrace for the Governor of this State to come down here and ask us to cut his budget and then the Democratic majority didn't allow us to discuss the issues, so Mr. Chairman, I think that if you're in tune with your national party, you should be thinking in terms of cutting his and putting the welfare or public aid or mental health."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, it appears as if the Republican side has already taken their break for dinner, and I would like to respectfully ask that we not break for dinner and have a ruling from the Chair that we work straight through, so that we can get this work done, because



if we're going to take a break for dinner, it's only going to get worse, and I think we have to act responsibly and move ahead and consider these matters in a reasonable light."

Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, on the Bill."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am really concerned about this budget, and I think it's important that we take this back and reconsider this. Now the Governor...."

Bradley: "Pardon me, Mrs. Stiehl, but will the two Gentlemen standing right in front of her please sit down."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Governor has come before us and advised us that we have a financial crisis and if this is so, I think it's our duty and our responsibility to take this budget back and reconsider it, and cut where we can cut, because if we have to go in and start cutting the schools and cutting education, then this is where we're going to be in trouble and I think we're all remiss in our duties if we don't take this budget back. I think that this is a very, very inconsiderate action on the part of the Sponsor of this Bill. I think that it's important that we take this back. We have a duty to act in a responsible fashion and go back and report to the People that we responsibly cut this budget. Thank you."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 512 is the ordinary appropriation for the civil defense agency and I think that the Membership should be aware of the fact where this money comes from. And if you take a look at the Amendment that was proposed, it was proposed with a six percent cut of ten million dollars, but the ten million dollars is not all State money. There is \$1,371,000 out of General Revenue and the rest of it, Ladies and Gentlemen, is from other funds, not from State funds. The largest portion is seven million dollars and that comes from the Federal Aid Disaster Fund. Now the agency is the state liaison with the Federal Government for the administration of emergency funds supplied by the Federal government for disaster relief. Now, if the Republican Party wants to be in a position of stating that we should cut the disaster fund, our Federal funds coming into this State, let

it be so. If they want to be in a position of being against the



grants and the hardware assistance and this program is for supplies, equipment and training, and is funded equally by the federal and state governments on local agencies. Eligibility is determined by federal regulation. I'm explaining the Bill."

Bradley: "Pardon me Mr. Lechowicz, does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten on a Point of Order. State your Point Sir."

Totten: "Yeah, well we were on the Bill and he starts explaining the Amendment. I think he's out of order."

Bradley: "It's very difficult to tell..."

Totten: "The Amendment hasn't even been introduced yet."

Bradley: "I don't think your Point is well taken Sir. Go...Proceed Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I think all we're doing is explaining what's exactly in the Bill and where the money comes from."

Bradley: "Proceed Sir."

Lechowicz: "We have ah...the administrative fund from the federal government based on a fifty percent matching grant to facilitate both state and local governments in the operation of the Civil Defense Agencies. It's a fifty, fifty. Community Shelter Planning. Radio...maintenance and calibration. This is again using the grants that any agency performs inspections, maintenance and calibration of all Civil Defense Radiological instruments in the State. This is what the seven million dollars is for, and it's federal money. Now out of the total budget of ten million, we're talking about one million dollars in General Revenue. I think this Bill deserves a strong 'aye' vote. It's a little bit untimely to...and really you're delaying tactics to go on every Bill based upon a six percent of the total budget. Let's look where the funds come, come from and make the necessary adjustments accordingly. I strongly recommend an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "The question is shall Senate Bill 512 pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Well, at some point, some hard decisions are going to have to be made on this budget, and we might as well start here. I'm right now having an Amendment drawn up for a six percent across the board cut of the Public Aid grants, and apparently, the people from the inner-



city who benefit the most from this, don't give a damn whether they get it or not. If we don't cut it here, we're going to have to cut it some...on some catagorical grant. What about the cities? Do they really want part of the, part of the income tax, part of their share of the income tax cut back? That's where the money has to come from Ladies and Gentlemen. Now, I just can't help but mention in view of the previous speaker's comments, that if a true disaster occurs, it is entirely conceivable that the Governor can call an emergency Session of the General Assembly. I've seen emergency aid go to the federal government lickity-split for a hurricane about eleven years ago, and the money poured out in the tens of millions of dollars to Louisiana. Now surely we are as competent as the federal government. I would comment in passing, that I wonder if the Community Shelter Program could be, perhaps, directed more to the inner-cities so that there might be sufficient housing for the people there that is decent."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos to explain his vote."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that we are making ah...a very irresponsible act here if we don't approve this appropriation in its present form. Because the cut that they are asking, with their Amendment, is not six percent, it's sixty percent, because the General Revenue Fund on this Bill only as er...Mr. Lechowicz stated is only one million, three hundred seventy-one thousand, five hundred dollars. If you take three hundred thousand out of the General Revenue Fund, you're only going to have at that time, Mr. Speaker, less than a million dollars. I think that it's high time that we act responsibly. There is no time, I tried to get in touch with the Director, and we cannot use a sledge hammer when we need a scaple. Therefore time is needed to do this in the proper, responsible fashion, because I also like to have the budget reduced, but not in this manner, and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Umm...I think Representative Lechowicz explained to the Members the reasons why we should vote green on this particular appropriation. I think it's one where



there are a great amount of federal funds...ah...that may be in jeopardy, if we play with this thing, and I think that we should pass this thing out and let it fun...ah...it's proper course."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 23 'nos', 41 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Sir, your light was not flashing. The next Bill is Senate Bill 525."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 525. A Bill for an Act creating the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act and repealing and amending other Acts, Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Mr. Leverenz, you wish to be recorded as 'yes' on 512? 525. Been read a third time, Representative Barnes, the Gentleman from Cook."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 525 repeals the abused child Act and creates the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. The proposed Act provides the following changes from the existing law. One, it extends the definition of child from person under 16 years of age, to persons under 18. Two, it defines the abused and neglect. Three, it defines abused to include sexual abuse, physical injury and mental injury inflicted on a child by accidental means by a legal guardian. Four, it expands the group of persons who must report to include coroners, and any other person who has reason, reasonably causes to suspect a child has been abused or neglected. Five, it permits and defines the temporary protection custody of abused and neglected child by a physician. Six, it requires that the Department of Children and Family Service to reimburse a person for color photographs and X-rays pursuant to abuse and neglected child investigations. Seven, it permits the...ah.. DCFS to delegate to Law Enforcement officials the performance of investigation. Eight, it requires that the identification of child believed to have caused the abused or neglect of a child be included in the Report. Nine, it provides immunity for persons participating in good faith in the making of the Report. Ten, it mandates that the person making or investigating a Report testified fully in a judicial proceeding. Eleven, it mandates DCFS to keep a central register of



Child Abuse and Neglected Report, and twelve, it makes it a Class A misdemeanor for an unauthorized dissemination of information contained in a central register. This Bill was passed overwhelmingly in the Senate. It passed out of Committee overwhelmingly. It has one Amendment, it deletes the provision that any person required to report a case of sus...suspected child abuse or neglect who willfully fails to do so is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an Act that has come to the attention to many of us through the reports of many, many abused cases in this State. It's an updating of the law as they now exist, and added to that, is...in...the effects of a letter that I just received yesterday morning from the Department of Children and Family Services which prescribe that if we act upon this Act in...in...in...ah...dispatch prior to June 27, that the state would be recipient of approximately \$116.00 in federal grants for these purposes. I would move, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House that we adopt Senate Bill 525."

Bradley: "The question is shall Senate Bill 525 pass? All those in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no.' The Lady from Lake Mrs. Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Umm...ah...I'm simply...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm the co-sponsor with Representative Barnes on this Bill. I recommend it. This Bill will make it possible for federal funds to come to this state to combat this very, very serious and deplorable condition known as child abuse, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote. Prior to that, an announcement from the Chair, that there has been a request to take some pictures in the Chambers, so please smile. Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "I just looked at the Board. There's no need to explain my vote, I think there is some ramifications to this Act that have not been brought out, and...ah...have not been discussed and I think this Act that while well intended, unfortunately will enable every crackpot who wants to file a complaint against their neighbor to call the police and have their neighbor investigated, and I...I just don't think it's a well conceived and formulated Bill. The intent is fine, but in my judgment it is not a good Bill for that reason."





Bradley: "The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 155 'ayes', 1 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 529."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 529. A Bill for an Act to regulate certain practices of mortgage lenders in the administration of Escrow Accounts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Ah...Senate Bill 529 is a Bill that provides an option to mortgage borrowers so that they may receive interest on funds set aside for payment of taxes. It's very similar to...ah... House Bill 1656 which passed out of here 123 to 1. Essentially, what it does is it gives an option now to the borrower at the time of making the mortgage that they can set up a collateralized account in lieu of the Escrow for...ah...payment of the taxes, and they will receive interest on that collateral accounts that they do pledge and, also, provides that when a mortgage has been reduced to sixty-five percent, there will no longer be any need for the...ah...Saving and Loans to require the setting up of an Escrow. It also says that the...ah...smaller Savings and Loans, especially Downstate, using the capitalization method...ah...do not have to do this, and...ah...let's see, finally it takes affect January 1, 1976 and it says that the time that the mortgage is made, that the S&L shall inform the borrower that this option is now available. It has the full...well, as a matter of fact, the Bill was drafted in conjunction and cooperation with the Committee members and the Illinois Savings and...ah...Savings and Loan League. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 529 pass? All those in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', those 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 132 'ayes', 5 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 541."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 541. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 541 amends Article 34 of the School Code, applying to the City of Chicago. Provides that the Board of Education may enter into an employment agreement with groups or individuals for a period up to three years. There's no opposition to the Bill."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 541 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those 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 147 'ayes', 4 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 558."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 558. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a new provision in the Code which provides for the allowance of legal expense to the written on a group basis. At the present time, the Department does not have the authority to govern such a group issuance, and this will give them the right to do so. I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 558 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those 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 149 'ayes', 4 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 608."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 608. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Lieutenant Governor, for the Technical Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of the Lieutenant Governor. Third Reading."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones."

Jones, E.: "Yeah, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 608 is the ordinary and contingency expense for the Lieutenant Governor's Office. It appropriates Three Hundred, Forty-six Thousand, and One Hundred Dollars for the contingency ex-



pense for the Lieutenant Governor. Seventy-six Thousand, Eight Hundred and Forty Dollars for the Technical Advisory Committee under which the Lieutenant Governor is the Chairman, and also a Hundred and Fifty-Thousand Dollars for the Abandoned Mine, Land and Reclamation Council, and I move for its adoption."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer on the question."

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

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Meyer: "Does this budget include the...Governor Walker's six percent reduction?"

Jones, E.: "The budget request for the Lt. Governor's office is approximately Thirty Thousand Dollars less than it was last year. This Bill was moved to Second Reading...ah...when I was absent yesterday, but I don't believe it do include the Governor's six percent cut."

Meyer: "That's great."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Members of the General Assembly, I rise in support of the Bill as it is, even though we we've had...ah... an Amendment and the Chairman of the Appropriation's Committee said that maybe he would bring it back, but I'd like to point out to the Members of the General Assembly. this is one of the few budgets that have come before the Appropriations Committee in which the ...ah... statutory officer has provided us with a budget that is less than what it was in the previous Fiscal Year, and I think he is to be commended for that. In addition, the...ah...Appropriations Committee in its not so wisdom way, did put an increase on it, but we did it and we had an Amendment to cut that back, but we're not going to pursue that, and I'd ask for a favorable vote on Senate Bill 608."

Bradley: "Did your Amendment increase the amount of money, Mr. Totten?"

Totten: "You know better than that."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 608 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those 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 164 'ayes', 0 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 610."



O'Brien: "Senate Bill 610. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

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

I'd just like to take a moment first to thank Representative Deavers and Chairman Merlo, who took care of this Bill in Committee while I was unable to be present. I have a second comment to make...ah... when Senator Partee asked me to take this Bill, sponsor this Bill in the House, I was glad to do so. At that, thereafter, however, I found that it covered a request by the Horace Mann Insurance Company, and I would like this House to be aware of the fact that my firm does represent Horace Mann on very few occasions. However, I don't believe there's any conflict of interest, but I did want you to be aware of their relationship to this Bill. This Bill itself is... was introduced at the behest of Horace Mann, and give them the right to write educator's professional liability insurance on a group basis. Horace Mann has been writing that insurance for several years. Just the other day, a few months ago, the Attorney General ruled that under existing Illinois Law, they were not authorized to do so, and in order for them to continue writing the business that they have been writing, this provision was necessary. When they initially presented the Bill, they asked for some additional group coverage, however the members of the Insurance Committee disagreed with that, and I agreed with their comments. An Amendment was made to restrict it solely to that particular educators liability that they are presently writing, and I would appreciate an affirmative vote on this Bill."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 610 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 158 'ayes', 0 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 612."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 612. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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



Senate Bill 612 amends the Judicial Retirement Article of the Illinois Pension Code. The Bill provides, first, pension...er... credit for service as an assistant to the judge of the Probate Court of Cook County, and as a trial assistant to the Chief Judge of the Municipal Court of Chicago. According to the Pension Laws Commission this is service of a judicial character, probably in a greater degree than several types of service for which pension credit has been approved in the prior years such as Justice of the Peace, Police Magistrate, or Master in Chancery. Secondly, it extends from January 1, 1974 to January 1, 1976, the period of time for a rescission of waiver to membership on the part of judges who elected not to become a member of the system. According to the Pension Laws Commission, this provision for extending the period for rescinding a waiver is a perennial one, and in order to receive pension credit for judicial service prior to becoming a member, the judge must, of course, make appropriate employee contributions with interest. Thirdly, the Bill provides for an additional vesting period with retirement age at age 62. Ah...supplementary to the present ten year vesting, with retirement at age 55, and according to the Pension Laws Commission this reflects the established policy in Illinois. Four, the Bill restores the conversion option regarding transfer of pension credit between retirement systems. According to the Pension Laws Commission in 1973, restricted this option, and according to the Commission that Amendment violated the contractual rights of employees and this will restore...ah...and reflect the original policy of the Commission, ah...prior to 1973. Five, the Bill provides a salary in effect the date of retirement shall be the salary base used for the computation of the retirement annuity according to Mr. Weinburg, the Actuary, this restores the provision that was previously in the Article from 1941 to 1967, and equates this system with the General Assembly System. And six, and finally, it clarifies the status of minor children of a judge who becomes unmarried, and according to the Pension Laws Commission the proposal effecting the minor children is of a clarifying nature and is intended to more clearly define the rights and benefits. That is what the Bill does, and I would ask for your support."



Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 612 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Somebody wish to explain their vote? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Yourell 'aye'. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 10 'nos', 16 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 618."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 618. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...Senate Bill 618 does...ah...amend the Unemployment Compensation Act. It deals with the...ah...situations that are now created as a result of state, local, and private enterprise attempting to set up training programs which provide for a retraining of unemployed workers. As you may know,...ah...under some of the programs, including Manpower Training Act, and a number of programs that have been established on the local level and through private industry, a number of parties who are engaged in these training for retraining and upgrading their skills...ah...receive some sort of compensation. This Bill merely amends the Unemployment Compensation Act to exclude from the Unemployment Compensation Act those payments that are made to them, so that they may receive this training and it does not...and the payments made under the various programs without making them ineligible for unemployment compensation. The Bill provides that any assistance or amounts paid to the individual in the training program is deducted from the amounts they would normally receive from unemployment compensation, and I would ask for your favorable support."

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

Hudson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Bradley: "He will."

Hudson: "Uh...Representative Beaupre, would you give us...ah...give us some examples of the types of training programs that are involved here, or that could be involved."

Beaupre: Uh...General Electric, a private employer has a training program



ah...for people who, at one time, worked for them. They are attempting, having the background on the employee that has been laid off, they have some idea as to what their potential skills are, and they ah...have provided a training program to upgrade those skills. They pay them some subsistence, Level 4, being engaged in the program, but it is not as much as they might receive under unemployment compensation, or as they might under a...the job or the task that they were previously assigned to. This Bill would allow payment of the difference out of the Unemployment Compensation Act Funds."

Hudson: "One more question, Representative. Would it be questioned...or would it be possible for a worker to say, engage in a training program of some kind that was not really directly related, but perhaps indirectly related to his...ah...employment, and be eligible for the unemployment compensation?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, wish to close Sir?"

Beaupre: "I'm not sure I understand the question."

Bradley: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Hudson: "Well, what I'm asking is, does the training program have to be directly related or sponsored by, or a part of the employment picture that the...ah...employee finds himself in?"

Beaupre: "My understanding is that it doesn't, but it would have to be an approved training program by the Department of Labor."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill, Sir?"

Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Hudson: "I'm going to oppose this measure, because I think that here again, we are setting the stage for unemployment comp, that is changing the philosophy of what unemployment compensation originally intended to do, and as I understand the philosophy of unemployment compensation, that was to come into play when an employee finds himself involuntarily out of employment through no fault of his own. Then unemployment comp came into play, and it seems to me that what we're doing here, as we get into this area is seriously changing the philosophy of unemployment compensation to something that if extended to its fullest degree can increase unemployment compensation costs, immeasurably, to the employer. The big employer may be able to afford these. The smaller employer, I doubt, will be able to foot the



bill, and this is another avenue, I think, that is going to be not salutary, but quite the contrary to...ah...the business picture in Illinois, and I would urge a no vote on this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I wish to speak on behalf of Senate Bill 618. The purpose of the Bill is to facilitate certain training programs which are underway today, and to provide that participants in the training programs will not be precluded from participating in those training programs simply because they have to be a recipient of unemployment benefits at this particular time. Absent this Bill, unless this Bill is passed, we will have a situation where people are currently receiving unemployment benefits and because of that fact they will be unable to participate in a program which is designed to enhance their skills for future employment. I certainly hope there isn't a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the Bill. It simply intended to facilitate the training of people to provide them with job skills, so that they can reenter the job market. I urge passage of Senate Bill 618."

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

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Tuerk: "Do I understand this Bill correctly, that a person can be eligible for unemployment compensation payment while attending a training course?"

Beaupre: "The answer is yes, but I will point out to you, and what I think you are concerned about Representative Tuerk, is the possibility of double payment, and the...ah...Bill specifically precludes the possibility of double payment so that any amounts of unemployment comp...any subsistence amounts or any amounts paid under the training program would be deducted from the amounts that the person would receive from unemployment compensation, so there's no possibility of double payment's under the Bill."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand that there's no double payment, but what is the rationale for giving a person unemployment comp. benefits when, if fact, he is gainfully employed in a training program?"

Beaupre: "Well, the rationale is that he is not gainfully employed, and





I...ah...the training programs are designed primarily to get them off the unemployment compensation rolls...ah...to get them...ah... upgrade their skills so that they may assume employment. The training programs are, are stepped up measures to retrain people so that they assume their role in society as a worker. Ah..."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand the philosophy of the training program, but is he not drawing some...ah...wages while he's being trained?"

Beaupre: "Well, he's drawing some funds, I don't know that you'd call them wages, they aren't being paid for their own self-training. They're being paid a certain amount to sustain them while they're in the training program."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman wish to close? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill...Sir, do you wish to close?"

Beaupre: "Yes."

Bradley: "The Gentleman to close."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would submit to you that the majority of these training programs, in fact, all of them, are designed to take people off the unemployed roll, to upgrade their skills, to give them the opportunity to assume employment, so that we may cut down on the number of people who are drawing unemployment compensation, thereby bringing about better experience factors for those employers that you're suggesting that we need to protect here. I think this is a fine measure, if we're going to discourage people from engaging in retraining programs because they might gain more money by remaining on the unemployment compensation rolls, than they would if they were engaged in a training program, then I think that we're defeating our own purpose. This Bill really provides an incentive to workers to retrain themselves, to upgrade their skills. It will ultimately result in a benefit to employers who have to pay into the unempcomp...unemployment compensation fund, and I would ask for your favorable support."

Bradley: "The Question is, shall Senate Bill 618 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those 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 150 'ayes', 4 'nds',



I...ah...the training programs are designed primarily to get them off the unemployment compensation rolls...ah...to get them...ah... upgrade their skills so that they may assume employment. The training programs are, are stepped up measures to retrain people so that they assume their role in society as a worker. Ah..."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand the philosophy of the training program, but is he not drawing some...ah...wages while he's being trained?"

Beaupre: "well, he's drawing some funds, I don't know that you'd call them wages, they aren't being paid for their own self-training. They're being paid a certain amount to sustain them while they're in the training program."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman wish to close? If not, the question is, shall Senate Bill...Sir, do you wish to close?"

Beaupre: "Yes."

Bradley: "The Gentleman to close."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would submit to you that the majority of these training programs, in fact, all of them are designed to take people off the unemployed roll, to upgrade their skills, to give them the opportunity to assume employment, so that we may cut down on the number of people who are drawing unemployment compensation, thereby bringing about better experience factors for those employers that you're suggesting that we need to protect here. I think this is a fine measure, if we're going to discourage people from engaging in retraining programs because they might gain more money by remaining on the unemployment compensation rolls, than they would if they were engaged in a training program, then I think that we're defeating our own purpose. This Bill really provides an incentive to workers to retrain themselves, to upgrade their skills. It will ultimately result in a benefit to employers who have to pay into the unempcomp..unemployment compensation fund, and I would ask for your favorable support."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 618 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those 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 150 'ayes', 4 'nos',



none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar, on the order of House Bills Third Reading, appears House Bill 289."

O'Brien: "House Bill 289, Tipsword. A Bill for an Act to make certain appropriations to various agencies for permanent improvements. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker...ah...I would like to move that this Bill be returned to...ah...Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments that several Members have filed."

Bradley: "The Gentleman requests that House Bill 289 be returned to Second Reading for purposes of Amendments. Now appears on the Calendar on Second Reading. For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner arise?"

Skinner: "I wonder if the Sponsor could tell the Membership whether these Amendments will raise the cost of state government in the next Fiscal Year, or lower it?"

Bradley: "Well, we could wait..."

Skinner: "I think the Sponsor will have to answer that."

Bradley: "He might not have all the Amendments, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "May not we be entitled to know the type of Amendment before we're asked to take it back on Second?"

Bradley: "I'm sure the Amendment will be explained before you're asked to vote on it Mr. Skinner. When you have the...you can request it. Amendment #5."

O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Boyle. Amends House Bill 289 on page 11, by inserting between line 31 and 32 the following and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 is...ah...five percent reapportionment Amendment. This provision was in the other CDB Bills, but somehow was left out of this House Bill 289. It allows them to adjust up or downward five percent. I move the adoption of Amendment #5."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 289. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'no'. The Amendments adopted. Further Amendments? Further Amendments?"



Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #6. Boyle. Amends House Bill 289 on page 5, line 22 by deleting 'for campground improvements' and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from MacCoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is necessary to correct errors in wording of the original Bill. and in the First Committee Amendment. The numbers in the projects remain the same when the ah.... original Bill and the original Amendment were drawn. the Department was not allowed to participate in the drafting and several errors were made in the determination of what the projects actually were. They changed the names, but the amounts remain the same. I move the adoption of Amendment #6."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #6 to House Bill 289. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Pardon me, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I don't have these Amendments. Have they been distributed? Some of the Members indicate that they haven't been. I've got #10. I don't have anything before it."

Bradley: "Gentleman from MacCoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "I don't believe that they go up to #10. Oh, they go beyond? All right. I've got 5 and 6 and 7 that were distributed. I don't know about anything after that."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "You've got House Bill up there. Is this House Bill or Senate Bill?"

Bradley: "House Bill, Sir. We're on House Bills, Third Reading and we move this back to Second. Yes, Sir. This Amendment has been distributed, and you're offered the adoption of Amendment #6 to House Bill 289. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #7. Boyle. Amends House Bill 289 as amended in Section 2 and so forth."

Bradley: "Gentleman from MacCoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Amendment #7 is the same as ah..... #6. It has the same effect. It repairs some of the language that did not accurately reflect the project nomenclature and I move the adoption of Amendment #7."



Bradley: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #7 to House Bill 289.

All in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #8. J. D. Jones. Amends House Bill 289 as amended by inserting after Section 15 the following, Section 15a and so forth."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment provides for the funding for the bicentennial designated building to be built at the fairgrounds, which was committed in the previous session by a \$80,000 appropriation for the planning and development of this project and it is now ready to be executed and has the support of the bicentennial commission, which is the official sponsor for it and I move the adoption of this Amendment."

Bradley: "Gentleman moves the adoption of this Amendment to House Bill 289. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Will the Sponsor indicate the fiscal impact of Amendment #8.?"

Bradley: "Will, the Sponsor what, Sir?"

Lechowicz: "Indicate the dollar amount in Amendment #8."

Jones: "\$3,200,000."

Lechowicz: "For a bicentennial building at the State fairgrounds."

Jones: "That's right."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to have to oppose Amendment #8 to House Bill 289. When this was originally redrafted and came out as a Committee Bill, we reviewed the project by project basis on justification of costs, and in turn we took out everything that was part of the accelerated program and brought in the normal costs that were suppose to be included in the Fiscal 76 budget, and upon this review, we eliminated the bicentennial building that is supposed to be constructed at the State fairgrounds. because of the availability of convention sites within the Springfield area. We think it's a waste of taxpayers money of over three million dollars to put this facility at the State fairgrounds for this basis. For this reason, I am opposing Amendment #8 to this Bill."



Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #8 to House Bill 289. All those in favor of the adoption say 'aye'. Opposed say 'no'. Amendment is lost. We'll have a roll call on the Amendment. All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #8 to House Bill 289 will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Would you please record Bradley as voting 'aye'. I'm a Member of the Bicentennial Commission. David Jones to explain his vote."

Jones: "In explaining my vote, the previous speaker, who is Chairman of the Appropriations Commission, did so state that the amount that was removed from the budget was an eight million dollar item, which included other improvements at the State Fairgrounds, and this was part of the eight million dollars that was removed. But this project was approved by previous administrations. It was officially endorsed by the Bicentennial Commission, and I'm sure that it needs your support to proceed with the building. The plans are drawn. The schedule for the execution and construction of the plans will have available for July 4th dedication, ah... of 76, and included in the plans for the building is to be an agricultural exhibit that would delineate the agricultural history of Illinois, which has... our biggest export industry, and this is a needed facility and one that has been approved by this General Assembly in concept in the previous sessions and I urge your support at this time."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, to explain his vote."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'aye' vote on this, I think the Members should be aware of the fact that we lost a building out there and that the fact that we can use a building and this would be a permanent building and would serve for the purpose of all time, and with the fact that we did give our support of this last time and the fact that we do have this building that we do now need, I think you should think twice on it."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 49 'ayes', 91 'nos', 2 voting 'present' and this Amendment having failed to receive a majority, is hereby



declared lost. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #9. Kosinski. Amends House Bill 289, on page 12, line 3 and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I handled the appropriation for the Department of Corrections and its penal institutions. During the course of the pruning of the Governor's exceledated bonding program, it's my feeling that certain areas were injured in the correctional institutions that I would like to replace with a possibility of additional bonding. The total amount of this appropriation is \$2,089,150. However, \$1,005,000 is in suit for incorrect changes to ah.... the Vienna and this money, I understand, will be returned to the State at the end of the suit. The ah.... additional of \$148,6000 for perimeter lighting at Pontiac for security purposes. They still have step down equipment on 1,500 volt system, which is, of course, antique. Areas of that, those yards are not properly illuminated for ah.... concern about prisoners. Ah.... Menard has need of rehabilitation of the inmates kitchen and dining room, an area which is always the cause of the spotful riots and by dividing it into four sections, they will prevent this from occurring. There are other repaired defects at Vienna and Joliet, and I ask for the adoption of this Amendment."

Bradley: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #9, to House Bill 289. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Further..... In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #10. Schisler. Amends House Bill 289 on page 34 by inserting between lines 32 and 33 the following: Section...."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #10 to House Bill... to Senate Bill 289, House Bill adds \$7,500,000 to the Capital Development Bond Fund for ah.... conservation of energy within the existing and proposed state owned buildings such as the electrical power management, power plant updating and building systems redesign and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."



Bradley: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #10 to House Bill 289. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to ah... Amendment #10 to House Bill 289. What many Members are trying to do with these Amendments is restore all the Governor's accelerated bond program into House Bill 289 and both the Senate and the House have already indicated their will by cutting these. We cut ten million dollars out of this project and now the Sponsor's trying to put \$7,500,000 back in it. I think that this Amendment should not be adopted."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, on the Amendment."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Representative Totten pointed out is correct. This Amendment calls for an approval of a \$7,500,000 appropriation, and I think that it should be defeated."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, who's sponsoring the Amendment?"

Bradley: "Mr. Schisler, Sir."

Grotberg: "Ah... may I ask a question about the Amendment?"

Bradley: "If the Gentleman wishes to respond. He indicates he will."

Grotberg: "Would you say once more what the \$7,000,000 is for, Representative Schisler?"

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the ah... 7.5 million would be for updating existing state facilities and also for ah... conservation measures to new state buildings. There would be a considerable ....."

Grotberg: "Conservation, Mr. Schisler? or ....."

Schisler: "Conserving energy."

Grotberg: "May I address the Bill?"

Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Grotberg: "Well, contrary to what ah... both the Minority and the Majority spokesman of appropriations have hinted, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Corrections budget was only the necessary, ordinary capital expenditures were ever in the accelerated bond program. On my best analysis, remember now, that Representative Ewing, Representative Fennessey and myself





have the impacted area with six correctional institutions. I have held long dialogs with those Directors and department people long before this Amendment was brought to task and Corrections has... what?"

Bradley: "You wish to proceed, Sir?"

Grotberg: "CDB. I'm sorry. If you're on conservation, I'm in total error. Are we through with the Corrections Amendment? I stand to be corrected."

Bradley: "The question is, shall ....."

Grotberg: "Particularly, I agree with my Minority Leader, I have yet to get the creditability of the Majority spokesman."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Amendment #10 to House Bill 289 pass? All those in favor will say 'aye'. Opposed say 'no'. It appears that the 'no's' have it and the Amendment is lost. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #11. Flinn. Amends House Bill 289 as amended in Section 11 in the second sentence and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, on the Floor? Representative Tipsword, do you want to proceed? The Gentleman is not here."

Tipsword: "Mr. ah...Perhaps I can present the Amendment."

Bradley: "All right, Sir, proceed."

Tipsword: "This is Amendment #11, is it not? Amendment #11."

Bradley: "Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "By deleting 'for Illinois Community College Board \$33,040,027' and inserting in lieu thereof 'for Illinois Community College Board \$41,440,027' and at the end of Section 11 by deleting and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I believe that this is the one that provides additional monies for the East St. Louis Joint Community College Division. Is that the one?"

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

Lechowicz: "Well that's included in that, but there's more to the Amendment then we just pointed out. Ah... it increase for the Illinois Community College Board the figure of \$33,040,027 to



\$41,440,027. It also amends the Community College of East St. Louis by \$1,800,000. It's a new building for the.... the construction of a building at the approximate cost of that building is \$1,800,000 and it's also for the construction of a Joint East St. Louis Community College and Division of Vocational Technical Education for an estimated cost of \$400,000. This is ah.... an item, that if we wanted to, we could reamend 289 and incorporate every school district, every building that you wanted to, but unfortunately, it would have to go under the accelerated program and for this reason, I'm going to have to oppose Amendment #11 to House Bill 289."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I was correct to begin with. I have here before me the justification left with me by the Sponsor of the Amendment, Representative Flinn. The justification is very short and reads as follows: 'This Amendment provides for the funding necessary to acquire the land, to plan and to construct a joint skill training center, including the equipment, utilities and site development necessary to provide for a skill training center in East St. Louis, Illinois, to be administered in accordance with a joint agreement between the East St. Louis Community College and the Division of Vocational Technical education.' The total required for this undertaking is \$8,400,000, and although I have not helped in the preparation of this Amendment, I have served on the Commission for Economic Development and we found that in the area of East St. Louis, much to our sorrow that ah.... while very few of the high school graduates of that area are going onto college. We also found that there were very few skilled vocational, very few of them taking advantage of skilled vocational technical training, simply because it was not available in the area and many people, both highschool graduates and those who had no skills or had lost their jobs, for which there was no demand for jobs, were unable to become retrained, so that they could be usefully employed as taxpaying citizens, and as a result of that I am sure, this is very much why this kind of proposal has been made here by Representative Flinn. Perhaps some of the Representatives that also serve that area might have something to add to that."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, on the Amendment."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly.

I, too, arise in opposition of the Amendment. The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee has very adequately indicated the reasons for the Amendment, Amendment #11 to House Bill 289, should be defeated."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, on the Amendment."

Madison: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Amendment #11. If there's any area in the State of Illinois that would need this skill center, it would be the East St. Louis area, and I think that we have a responsibility to provide the kind of help that that area needs and I would hope with it, that we would support this Amendment. Thank you."

Bradley: "Mr. Madison, the Chair would like to call your attention to the fact that we're on House Bills, Third Reading, also. The Gentleman wish to close? If not...."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing that is very definitely needed. We found that this area of the State had the lowest training in job skills, the ah.... fewest number of people able to take advantage of job skill training of any area in the United States. I mean, in the State of Illinois. I feel that this is very needful. It is also one of the very high, unemployment areas of the State of Illinois. It's also an area that is very low in skills that is needed in our industrial ah.... in the industrial positions that are available throughout the St. Louis area, so I feel this is probably very needful. I realize that this is part of the accelerated bonding program and now because of the death of that program, is no longer available and was taken out of this ah.... proposal, this Bill, House Bill 289, for that reason. It is something that is definitely needed for the people of the East St. Louis area."

Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Ah.... It is anticipated that in the ah.... metro-east section of Illinois-East St. Louis area, there will be, in the not too distant future, an airport and the turning around of manufacturing industries to locate there, and certainly if there is going to be an upsurge of economic activity, ah.... it will be necessary to



JUN 19 1975

149.

have a facility to train and development young people who could work in these new jobs. Ah..... I think everyone here knows that this is an area of very high aid, and the emphasis has to be for training and job opportunity, and for those reasons, it is vitally necessary that this request for ah... vocational technical education skills center be approved at this time."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Amendment #11 pass? All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed by saying 'no'. The Opinion of the Chair. the 'nos' have it. Are there five Members who wish to have a roll call? One, two, three, four, five. The question is, shall Amendment #11 to House Bill 289 pass? All those in favor, will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 46 'ayes', 85 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. This Amendment, having failed to receive the majority, is hereby declared lost. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #12. Kane. Amends House Bill 289 on page 15, line 18....."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another corrective Amendment. It ah..... restores two lines that were inadvertently left out. There's \$100,000 for the installation of a sprinkler system and \$150,000 for purchase of equipment for the medical-surgical building at the Medical School here in Springfield. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #12 to House Bill 289. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Bradley: "Third Reading. House Bill 99..... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, I thought I had your attention, and I wanted to.... there were a couple of Amendments that Representative Boyle had, that I think we passed over."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Bradley: "They're not at the desk, Sir. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Boyle handled his Amendments. They were the first two Amendments that were presented to this Bill when it was taken back to Second Reading."

Bradley: "Is that all right, Mr. Houlihan? They were already adopted, I believe. We started with Amendment #5 here today. House Bill 995."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 995. Darrow. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 995 appropriates 20 million dollars of transportation Series A Bonds to the Department of Transportation for the supplementary freeway land acquisition construction and preliminary engineering. This is the extension of the east-west tollway from Sterling to Rock Island, Illinois. Amendment #1 specifies that this fund is to be used only for this section of the tollway. Amendment #2 is our FEPC Amendment of Mrs. Younge. Amendment #3 is Mr. Lechowicz' 12 million dollars for the City of Chicago. This is the amount of money that is owed to the City of Chicago by the Department of Transportation and the running on bond acknowledges that they are indebted to the City of Chicago in this amount. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 995 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 123 'ayes', 9 'nos', 13 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate.... House Bill 1342."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1342. O'Daniel. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State highway safety program. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. O'Daniel."



O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, ah.... House Bill 1342 appropriates \$12,182,700 to the Traffic Safety Coordinating Committee for Fiscal Year beginning July 1, 1975. This Bill was amended in Committee by deleting \$568,000. It provides for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the State Highway Safety Program. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 1342 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On this question, there ..... Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 118 'ayes', 14 'nos', 10 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Gaines wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. House Bill 1996."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1996. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Business and Economic Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1996 provides for \$1,900,000 for a loan to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority, for the non-federal matching share to build progress plaza in the East St. Louis area of St. Clair County. The Economic Development administration of the Department of Commerce has made available a grant of \$2,300,000 to build this industrial park. This offer of grant will terminate if not used by June, 1976. The Federal Grant is for site improvements, earth work, rail connections, roads, landscaping, etc. on the proposed site for Progress Plaza, which is to be located on Highway I-55 and 70 and Illinois highway 203. House Bill 1996 provides for the non-federal matching funds in the amount of \$956,000 and the balance of \$1,900,000 is to be used to purchase land for the park. Progress Plaza Industrial Park will provide during the construction period at least 1,000 jobs for the people of St. Clair County. It will, in addition, result in between one and two thousand permanent jobs in St. Clair County. In our county over the last twenty years, there has been an.....I urge the passage of this Bill."



JUN 19 1975

152.

Bradley: "The question is, shall..... the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeow, I had a couple of questions. First, is this in the Governor's Budget?"

Younger: "No, but Director Schoda of BED that is over the Illinois Industrial Development Authority has said that he will aggressively attempt to get the cooperation of the Governor and he will aggressively pursue this park if given the opportunity by you to do so."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, briefly, we've heard.... you know, it's like a broken record, we've heard the Governor the other day state the nature of the State finances. Certainly, when there are by varied terms, it provides that they can't even spend this money during the year's period, by the very term, I would suggest that we ought not give them the opportunity to even try. So I would certainly, in line with the Governor's address the other night, ah.... start right here and eliminate \$1,900,000 that isn't even in his budget."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in behalf of House 1996. In fact, I'd just like to remind my Republican colleagues that a former colleague of ours from your side of the aisle, Representative James Peterson, came in behalf and he came in a number of times from Chicago. Then he came in and talked to me personally on the floor about the benefits of 1996. As the Lady has pointed out, that the Federal Government has approximately two and a half million dollars that they're going to provide for this industrial park, but unfortunately the area within the confines of this industrial park is an economic deprived area and they can't get the local share, so this is a way of providing a local share on a loan basis, which will be supervised by BED, to make sure the industrial park is built and is run according to State and Federal standards and upon the completion of the facility and hopefully there will be a profit making venture, the State will be reimbursed. I strongly suggest an 'aye' vote on House Bill 1996."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is very little I can say after Representative Younger and Representative



Lechowicz have so ably explained the contents of House Bill 1996. I can well recall, though, the debate on Second Reading and I can well recall all of the humane aspects of this Bill and joined with me by some of the Republican Leadership, when Representative Younge was talking to us about it. I can also advise you, being from southern Illinois that if there is an economic depressed area within the confines of the State of Illinois, it is in this particular area. Now as far as it not being in the Governor's budget, let me advise you that if you want to approach the cuts in a responsible manner, this should be given top priority. There is other areas that can be cut, double this, and not affect the welfare and the very livelihood of the People of that area, and yes, the people of the State of Illinois as this Bill would. I join with Representative Younge, Lechowicz and others in encouraging a unanimous vote for 1996."

Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. I think that Representative Younge has explained it very well. There's no area in the State of Illinois that is so depressed as the East St. Louis area. In fact I believe that it has the highest unemployment rate in the entire country, and if we, as a State, are ever to do anything to solve these problems, it's important that we vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, wish to close?"

Younge: "Yes, I ask for your favorable consideration."

Bradley: "The Lady.... The question is, shall House Bill 1996 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those 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 114 'ayes', 19 'nos', 12 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For the





purposes of announcements, we have a distinguished guest in the balcony. Ah..... A former Representative, he still is, Representative John Fary. John, I wish you'd stand and be recognized. House Bill 2036."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 2036. Ryan. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Attorney General. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Champaign arise?"

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, I think we should also recognize the fact that we have a visitor here who is sitting in Representative Fary's seat, the Speaker of the House."

Bradley: "Sir, would you please arise and be recognized. Oh, he's in the wrong seat. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Attorney General, and it appropriates \$9,219,210 and I would move for the passage of House Bill 2036."

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

Houlihan: "Ah..... Will Representative Ryan yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates..... Do you wish to respond, Sir?"

Ryan: "I'm not sure"

Bradley: "If you can make it a true-false question."

Ryan: "I'm all your's, Jimmy, go to it."

Bradley: "Multiple choice. He'll try to answer the question, Sir."

Houlihan: "Representative Ryan, we had talked extensively in the Committee about an effort to ah..... produce a little more accountability in the Attorney General's budget and to break out that budget ah.... by division as all the other budgets are. Has that Bill been amended in that fashion?"

Ryan: "Yes, Sir, it has, to the satisfaction of the ah..... Chairman of the Committee. I don't know what Amendment it is. I think it's Amendment #3, but I'm not sure, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Could you give us the ah..... Divisions that it was broken out into?"

Ryan: "Sure could. It's Amendment #4. It breaks it out for Operations. You want the dollar amounts, too, Representative Houlihan?"



Bradley: "For the information of the Members, Amendment #3 was not adopted."

Ryan: "This is #4, I believe."

Bradley: "I thought you were referring to 3 a minute ago."

Ryan: "I said I didn't know what number it was."

Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Ryan: "Representative Houlihan, what do you want? Numbers?"

Houlihan: "If you could just give us the division and then the total number for that division."

Ryan: "All right, under Operations for Administration, ah.... personal services \$1,112,700. Employees Retirement System \$74,550."

Houlihan: "George, you don't have to give each line item. I just wanted to get a general idea of the division and then the bulk amount in that division."

Ryan: "All right, under Administration-Personal Services, is that what you're talking about, \$1,112,700."

Houlihan: "Yeow."

Ryan: "Is that what you want, Jimmy?"

Houlihan: "Right, Right, George."

Ryan: "All right, ah.... Under representation of governmental agencies for personal services \$2,223,675. Public representation for personal services \$1,198,800. Inheritance tax personal services \$1,395,900."

Bradley: "Mr. Houlihan, further questions? I'm sorry, Sir."

Ryan: "Operations for all divisions, ah.... I don't know what you want out of there. There's about two, four, six, about eight line items, Representative Houlihan. It would probably be easier if you got a copy of this Amendment."

Houlihan: "All right, I don't have it on my desk here. Maybe you could just give me a copy of it."

Bradley: "We're not at the Amendment stage. We're on Third Reading, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I understand that. I understand that. I was wondering if Representative Ryan might ah.... want to take this back to Second Reading. In his effort, he has amended many of the Bills, or tried to amend many of the Bills with the six percent reduction, across



the board by line item. I wonder, maybe, if you would want to take this out of the Record, take it back to Second Reading, so we could ah..... reduce this ah..... appropriation."

Ryan: "Well, ah..... Representative Houlihan, I'm ah.... if I could get a little Order here, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Give the Gentleman some order."

Ryan: "I'd certainly be glad to ah..... discuss that possibility with you here this afternoon, Mr. Houlihan, ah..... I would like to point out to you that Amendment #2 of this Bill decreases the requested amount by \$194,025, which reflects ah..... about a six percent reduction. And ah....."

Houlihan: "Could you run those number by me once more, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I have some bad staff information here. It's about three percent. This is on..... Could I have a little Order, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "We're trying to get you some Order, Sir. Mr. Ryan, you wish to proceed?"

Ryan: "Well, Representative Houlihan, I'm sure that you should be familiar with this Bill. You were a Member of that Committee and voted on this Bill."

Houlihan: "Correct, and I voted for that ah.... three percent reduction which I think was resisted. Ah....."

Ryan: "Three percent? Did you offer an Amendment to cut this by more?"

Houlihan: "Representative Ryan, I had voted for that Amendment, which I've been advised is a little less than, or a little bit more than one percent. I was wondering if we couldn't take this back to Second Reading and amend it to six percent as you have, so wisely, advocated in many other instances."

Ryan: "Well, if you thought that was a wise jesture, Representative Houlihan, it's strange that you didn't go along with me on this, Representative....."

Houlihan: "Oh, Representative Ryan, quite the contrary....."

Ryan: "Let me point out..... Let me point out our position here, Representative Houlihan. once again, and if you'll listen closely, maybe you'll understand what we're trying to do here. It has never been



the intent of the Republican Leadership, or the Republican side of the aisle, to have a meat axe approach of it, all six percent cut on everything in...in any Bill. It's been our stand to take selective cuts where necessary, and not necessarily six percent, and we have done that with this Bill, and we've proposed that in all other Bills."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I've got a couple of questions for Mr. Ryan."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Giorgi: "How many patronage positions does Mr. Scott...ah...have throughout the State of Illinois, especially the lawyer positions?"

Ryan: "I assume that's a rhetorical question. Would you define patronage for me Representative Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Patronage? People he appoints to ah..."

Ryan: "Do you mean are there any GORE employees in this budget? There are none."

Giorgi: "I thought that might still be true."

Ryan: "No, there are none."

Giorgi: "But can you tell me how many patronage appointments Mr. Scott has throughout the State of Illinois that are lawyer positions?"

Ryan: "No I can't."

Giorgi: "Can't you?"

Ryan: "No, I can't tell you."

Giorgi: "You've been on the Appropriation Committee long enough to know you ought to know your Bill before you present it, don't you?"

Ryan: "Is that a question...ah...Representative Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Take it anyway you like, Ryan."

Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi, I wish you would confine your remarks to the Bill. The Gentleman from...ah...Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I've been working with both Representative Ryan and Representative Lechowicz on this...ah...and I think a little explanation is in order. When this Bill was first presented, it did not break it down into various divisions, and Representative Lechowicz requested that. It was broken down, eight percent into the normal categories, the twenty percent is not, because that's for the payment that's made to the Building Authority for the rent and such things as



the telephone bill and so on. This Bill as it's presently amended does not allow for any new employees in the Attorney Generals Office or any increases in salary over what they're presently making. There have been some salary increases in the last few months, but this reflects what the current cost of what the same number of people will be in the next year. Now, I would point out to you that as you heard from the breakdown, a number of the people employed by the Attorney General actually are assigned to various divisions...ah...throughout the State, and that's merely to help these other departments as provided by the Constitution by law. The rest of the people involved are busy and trying to...it's a money making outfit which makes money that helps run the state, and any serious deterioration of the number of employees would seriously affect the income of the state and work in reverse. There's no fat in this...ah...appropriation, and it has been cut already, actually it's about two percent, and that cut's it down to where there is no room for pay increases and no room for any extra employees. I think this is a fair budget."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question, and the question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed by saying 'no', 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan to close."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. In response to the Gentleman from Winnebago, as a Member of the leadership, I would certainly have expected him to be on top of an Amendment or a Bill such as this one that he has expressed a great deal of interest in in the past, and especially this one. Ah...I see nothing wrong with this Bill, there's been cuts made in it...ah...it's been divisionalized as requested by the Democrat Leadership, and it's now about two percent or three percent over the Fiscal '75 appropriation. and I would move a Do Pass."

Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 2036 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed, by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers to explain his vote."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had some ques-



tions about this budget and the previous question has been moved, and as a result, didn't have a chance to ask questions, but, I did have questions about the number of employees and I see there's going to be twenty-two...ah...more assistant attorney generals, and I wanted Representative Ryan to explain that and how these people are hired and if they are patronage employees or just what kind of employees they are, and I, also, see there are going to be some special investigators hired extra, and I wanted that to be explained, and also how this budget compared to last year, but nevertheless...ah...maybe Mr. Ryan will tell me tomorrow morning."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? On this question there are 149..uh... take the Record. On this question there are 151 'ayes', 3 'nos'. 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2103."

O'Brien: "House Bill 2103, Chapman. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Finance Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 2445."

O'Brien: "House Bill 2445."

Bradley: "Take it out of the record. Is Mr. Yourell on the Floor? Take it out of the record. 2476."

O'Brien: "House Bill 2476."

Bradley: "Take it out of the record. 2580."

O'Brien: "House Bill 2580, Deuster."

Bradley: "Is Mr. Deuster on the Floor? Take it out of the record. 2942, Mr. Brinkmeier. Take it out of the record. 3002, Mr. Shea."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3002. A Bill for Act making an appropriation to the State Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was originally introduced...with an appropriation to the State Board of Elections for Four and a half Million Dollars. It was re...reduced just shy of a Million Dollars in Committee. It's now Three Million Six. Ah...personal services are 202, retirement, social security, contractual 76...ah...travel 44, data processing...ah...no, those are the figures we took out, but...ah..."

Bradley: "Through Mr. Shea?"



Shea: "Yes."

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

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

Shea: "Yes Sir."

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Houlihan: "Ah...Representative Shea, under your proposed legislation, 3118 where there would be a reserved set aside, who would be the certifying officer to release funds for the Board of Elections?"

Shea: "Is that the Bill we're on and if you intend to support it, I'll be happy to tell you, it would be the Governor of the State."

Houlihan: "Jerry, don't be so hostile."

Shea: "I'm not hostile, I just think we should talk about the legislation here."

Houlihan: "Are you suggesting that the map is coming up tonight?"

Shea: "I don't know Jim."

Bradley: "Let's confine your remarks to Mr. Houlihan to 3002. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was closely scrutinized by both staffs. It was amen...ah...reduced by Nine Hundred Nineteen Thousand Dollars. There are no new employees, and I strongly recommend a 'aye' vote as amended."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider. Mr. Schneider?"

Schneider: "I'm ready."

Bradley: "Okay."

Schneider: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Shea: "Yes."

Schneider: "Jerry, on the basis of the synopsis ah...for the Bill, I see Three Hundred Thousand Dollars for special studies and educational programs. Would you kind of elaborate on that for me? What that means?"

Shea: "That Three Hundred Thousand was taken out."

Schneider: "Thank you very much."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Bradley: "Yield? He indicates he'll yield. Turn Mr. Madison on."

Madison: "Representative Shea, ah...as I understand it, there are either



four or five...ah...members of the State Board. Is that right?

Shea: "You mean, how many members are there?"

Madison: "Yes."

Shea: "Four."

Madison: "Four. Ah...are any of those members terms up, up, up...ah...  
expiring any time soon?"

Shea: "Two members have already expired."

Madison: "Have their reappointment's been made?"

Shea: "Not to the best of my knowledge."

Madison: "Representative Shea would you use your good influence of which  
you have quite a bit, to see that a member of the minority...ah...race  
is appointed as a member of the State Board?"

Shea: "The appointments have already been made."

Madison: "You mean they have not been confirmed."

Shea: "That's right."

Madison: "I see. Thank you."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman wish to close? If not, the question is, shall  
this Bill pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those  
opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who  
wished? Bradley 'aye'. The Clerk will take the Record. Simms 'aye'.  
On this question there are 156 'ayes', 1 'no', none voting 'present'.  
This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby de-  
clared passed. Collins 'aye'. 3006. House Bill 3006, Mrs. Younge."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3006. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to  
Metro-East Exposition Performing Arts Authority. Third Reading of the  
Bill."

Bradley: "Mrs. Younge? Is Mrs. Younge in the Chambers? House Bill 3006,  
Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Take it out of the record, please."

Bradley: "Take it out of the Record. 3023, Mr. Kozubowski. House Bill  
3023."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3023. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appro-  
priation to the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of  
Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the





House. House Bill 3023 would appropriate a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Law Enforcement for \$35,000.00, for fugitive return funds. This money goes to local enforcement departments and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The question is, the Representative from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor one question, please?"

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield, Sir."

Keller: "Walt, why did you take this money from the Road Fund?"

Kozubowski: "This money...ah...has always been taken from the Road Fund, Representative."

Keller: "I thought just a percentage of it before had always been taken from the Road Fund."

Kozubowski: "It is my understanding that it has always come from the Road Fund."

Keller: "It seem another way that we...uh...keep getting into the Road Fund money for other things, they start happening and showing up on substantive legislation like this, and I think in the prime legislation there's just a portion of it and I hope that when it gets over to the Senate that you'll amend it to the percentage that should come from the Road Fund and General Revenue."

Bradley: "Further discussion. If none, the question is shall House Bill 3023 pass? All those in favor will 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', 12 'nos', 8 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The request of the Sponsor of 3036, 34, 3040, 3041, take them out of the Record. 3052. House Bill 3052."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3052. A Bill for an Act provides for the selection of delegates to the National Nominating Conventions to establish political parties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3052 amends the Election Code to provide for the selection of delegates to the National Nominating Conventions by established political parties. This Bill address the need for the



Democratic Party in Illinois to conform to the Delegate Selection Rules to those adopted by the Democratic National Committee. Currently, there is some question as to whether or not the procedure is presently on the Statute's in Illinois would conform to the D and C Rules. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very important Bill. The Gentleman is correct when he states his Bill...ah...does meet the specifications of the Democrat National Convention and some of their crazy rules for the selection of delegates. But they have four alternatives and this is only one of the four alternatives. Curiously enough, this alternative would be the most favorable to the heavy Democratic congressional districts that lie primarily in the City of Chicago where four year's ago they had eight delegates and the most Republican districts...ah...more Republican districts had five delegates, such as mine. Under this formula, the...ah...Chicago districts will get ten or eleven delegates, and the other congressional districts of equal population such as the twelfth and thirteenth might be down to three or four delegates. Certainly no more than four, and the Chicago districts up to ten, possibly...ah...eleven delegates. I can't get the final figures I've asked for, but it's somewhere in that neighborhood, such as accorded the mini-convention. Now the problem with this is if you try to build a political party, you try to build it throughout the state and every congressional district. Each district is of equal population, and although I recognize that there's some fairness, I would support, I would support that formula which goes fifty percent on population, and fifty percent on the last two Presidential elections is what which is what which formula would be legal...ah...and similar to what we had four years ago when we had fifty percent on population and fifty percent based on the last Democratic vote in the last Presidential election. That formula would give some recognition to population as well as to the vote in the Democratic primary. Now Mr. Kozubowski's formula is fifty percent for the last two



Presidential Elections, the Democratic vote in those Elections and fifty per cent on the Primary. Now that gives no recognition to the population of the most populous district in the state. The 12th Congressional District probably has more people living within it today than any Congressional District in the State and yet it would only get three or four delegates under his plan where some of the Chicago Districts would get eleven or twelve delegates. Now apparently this form here was chosen by the Democratic State Central Committee. I hadn't received a copy of the proposal when, when we were told to vote on it by voice vote. It had been mailed to my home two days before. It had been approved by Democratic State Senate Committee but without full knowledge and full revealing of what the delegate situation would be. Apparently this was chosen because it would add the greatest strength to the Chicago districts and punish the suburban and downstate districts to the greatest extent and therefore I'm going to oppose this because together with the Congressional reapportionment in the apparent effort by some gentleman and I don't know whom to control the Democratic...ah...ah...delegation at the next national convention. Now I voted in 1972 in Miami Beach to seat the fifty-nine so called, Daley Delegates. I thought they were elected legally, they should have been seated. I vote against the seating of Mr. Houlihan at that convention and Mr. Holewinski and for the seating in the 59 Daley Delegates including our Assistant Majority Leader and some other people here. But that doesn't mean, that doesn't mean that we can elect people on some fair basis of distribution. This Bill doesn't, it makes it harder for us to build our party in suburban and downstate areas, it's discriminatory against us and although it meets the technical requirements of the Democratic National Committee and some of their word requirements, I have to oppose the Bill because there's an alternative formula that would have been fairer, fifty per cent on population and fifty per cent on the vote in the last two Presidential Elections and I urge everyone to vote 'no', because otherwise, we're going to end up with a delegation that's very uneven, very uneven and very unfairly distributed."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I...I rise in opposition to House Bill 3052. I think it inappropriate at a time when we are trying to get greater participation in matters of political parties from outlying areas from all over the state that this plan should be put in which has the effect of greatly increasing the strength of existing areas and hurting areas like the area from which I come and I do consider it to be particularly unfortunate that we have this two prong to tax.. ah...to deprive the people of my area and other suburban areas of their fair representation in matters of the national political scene....ah...A study that I had done by the Legislative Council shows that if this formula is used in the next convention, in the selection of delegates...ah...in contrast to the formula that was used at the last convention...ah...that it would have this effect that for the 24th Congressional District that whereas that district at the last convention would have been entitled to 7.65 per cent of the Illinois Delegates of the National Convention that under this new formula they would be entitled to 10.2 delegates. In other words, they would have a substantial increase from ...ah...7. from slightly over 7, slightly over 10 delegates as part of the Illinois Delegation. Now I notice the Sponsor did not give any justification for increasing the cities share of this...ah...he took it as a matter of course I guess, that the city is entitled to more and more. He has given no reason why the people of my area and other outlying arealy should be cut down for no reason at all in terms of representation and participation in national democratic politics. Like the Gentleman from Lake, I supported the seating of the Democratic Delegates elected from the City of Chicago, and like him live and sit and talk amongst men who are voted against in terms of the last Democratic Convention but I would say to you that if this trend continues in which more and more is taken in the city, in which the city seeks to



assert its hegemony over outlying suburban areas that it will force a cleavage in the Democratic Party in which we will not be able to cooperate with those in the city. There is no reason given for denying us this representation and I would urge the opposition to this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh. Do you wish to enter the Democratic...."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The former Assistant Minority Whip thinks that this was in tandem with the reapportionment Bill that's before us and I would want to repudiate ...ah...that right off the bat....ah...If they're in tandem I'm against this but on this Bill singly, I'm certainly very much for it. It seems to me that contrary what, to what other speakers have said that this embodies, one man, one vote. This provides that delegates to the national convention shall be elected from the areas where there are the most party members and that makes sense to me. I'd like to point out also that this is just one of three alternatives, one of hopefully three alternatives, there was a Bill passed earlier that would have provided a third or alternative C, which was based pretty much too on party strength in a particular Congressional District. Now, this Bill provides for the election and not the selection but it that's what the Democrats National Committee wants and this is what the Democratic State Central Committeement want, why I suppose it's all right with me. I don't know that it would be the choice of the Republican State Central Committee but they have two other choices to make, one of which is based soley on population. Now, I see nothing on earth wrong with using this as one of the three alternatives and if this is what the Democratic Party wants. I don't see why we should stand in their way and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski to close."



Kozubowski: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I certainly would like to answer some of the charges that were made by one of the Representatives from my side of the aisle. Indeed this program is approved by the Democratic State Central Committee of which he and myself are Members. This plan was thoroughly debated, it was considered in special executive session after our meeting to comply with the rules of the Democratic National Convention. This Bill also provide, I might mention to the Members, for the complete and total election of delegates from their own Congressional District. There will be no and I repeat, there will be no delegates elected at large. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 3052 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to explain his vote."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have inquired of the Sponsor and I, in fact I inquired of the State Central Committee as to what the change would mean, in terms of the delegates for various districts. I wasn't able to ascertain or be provided with that information and I think that's an important factor in this Bill. I think we ought to take into consideration not only primary voters but also I'd take into consideration a Democratic area or a population generally and until they provide that information I'm going to vote 'present'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew, to explain his vote."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I would like to reiterate the...comments made by Representative Pierce a little earlier. I would like to keep it somewhat more brief however and that simply is that if you look at this formula it is going to give absolutely no or criteria to the areas that might be having a growing Democratic party, in other words, we're going back eight years through two Presidential Elections and then we're going to base it solely upon that, giving absolutely no weight or at least a minimum per Congressional District. Now the Gentleman from Cook, the former Majority Leader on the other side



of the aisle has suggested that this is what the Democrat wants or all of you vote for it. Well, why don't you, in that case, just vote 'present' and let us find out how many of the 101 Democrats want it. We've got enough to do it if this is really what we want. I urge a 'no' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to point out what Representative McGrew just pointed out. Apparently there are two groups interested in the continuation of the present... present philosophy in the State of Illinois that the northeastern corner of the state shall control every Democrat in the State of Illinois and let me say now, I wonder why Representative Walsh is so interested in the Democratic party that he'd support a position contrary to downstate Democrats. It looks kind of fishy to me. And I'd like to say in...in not being able to question the Sponsor, why don't downstate Democrats have a chance to make their decision? Why does a group of down...of upstate Democrats controlled by one individual call the shots for the entire Democratic party. To me this is the same kind of a situation we're going to be confronted with when we vote on reapportionment. We downstate Democrats have never considered part of the Democratic party, as far as Cook County is concerned. We are at this moment and if you think the Republicans going to have the Democrats settle their own problems, you're badly mistaken. We let you settle yours, why don't you let the downstate take care of our problems and stay off and vote 'present' and let us show who runs the Democratic Party in Illinois. Downstate, upstate or Republican parties. This is a bad vote, let us do it ourselves."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't have any quarrel with the concept that..ah...Democrats should be represented as..an individual and individual voters in the national convention. What I would like to know though before voting for this Bill or against it, what it's going to do to individual Congressional Districts and until those figures are available I would vote 'present'."



Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

On this question there are 112 'aye', 23 'no', 26 voting 'present', This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3056."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3056. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Committee Bill. It came out of the Elections Committee and it regards Legislative Election contests. Involving the House Seats and the Senate Seats. It requires notice of contest to all three elected from the Legislative District. Now at the present time only one is notified, one is being contested. It provides that the Act does not change the authority of either Houses judges election and the returns in qualifications of its Members. Also there is an Amendment placed on it in respect to primary election contests, the Amendment requires notification of the contest to all the candidates and...ah...also in regards to discovery recount the Amendment...ah...in regard to discovery notified all the candidates that the discovery recount it to take place. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The question is...the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think this is a Bill that each and every Member of this House ought to...ah...listen to and decide for himself or herself how he or she would like to vote. What it's saying is that if you're running for reelection and you are reelected and it is by a narrow margin, whether it is you or another of the one of the other two people elected. That if there is an election contest all three of you will be challenged. Now that means you may have run first but as a fourth but if a fourth person is challenging he is challenging all three who have been seated. We had quite a bit of debate when we made this a Rule of the House Elections Committee. The Republican Members objected. However, there was an additional rule which provided for the Committee to exempt the other two Members from the Election





challenge. In the Committee discussion of this Bill, the Republican Members asked that this provision be included. Now, the Democrat Members did meet us half the way with the Amendment that has been offered and also with a provision that the rules of the House could determine the qualifications of the people who had been defeated, which means that we can go ahead and exempt those people. Now I want every Member to be aware of what is occurring here because it could effect each and every one of us. I for one am going to vote for this Bill. I think that you ought to be aware of what is included in its provisions."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 3056 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 40 'nos', 11 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3059."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3059. A Bill for an Act to amend Section IV of Public Act 78-1085. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Representative McClain back there? Senate Bill 3...or House Bill 3064."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3064. A Bill for an Act..."

Bradley: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 3067."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3067...."

Bradley: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 3069."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3069. A Bill for an Act creating the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes."

Barnes: "Since this...Since this is originally House Bill 1554 and Adeldine Geo-Karis was the principal Sponsor, I defer to her."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Board creating a Board of Higher Education to provide that there will be representation from the non-public college and universities added to the Illinois Board of Higher Education. No Board Member who represents either public nor public



...nonpublic institutions of Higher Education under this Bill may vote on the budgetary recommendations. The State Superintendent of Education shall replace the Superintendent of Public Instruction and I respect...respectfully request this...an 'aye' vote on this... ah...Section 1202 of the U.S. Higher Education Amendment of 1972 provides that if any state coordinating body...ah...coordinates post secondary education is to receive federal funding under this section. That coordinating body must be broadly and reputedly represented into the general public and private and independent schools. I might state that a number of states have already moved to make the compositions of boards...the Higher Boards of Education comply with the directive of the federal guidelines. The Board of Higher Education makes a master plan effecting both public and non-public colleges and universities. I respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Byers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Bradley: "She indicates she will."

Byers: "What was the Committee vote on this Bill?"

Geo-Karis: "It was unanimously...this was one of those Bills on the user list and was brought up by Executive Committee and Representative Matijevich is the Chairman of it, is here and it came out with a unanimous vote I understand."

Byers: "Is...Was this Bill on postponed consideration at one time?"

Geo-Karis: "No, not this one."

Byers: "According to the Calendar...to the Digest. It says that on May 23, Third Reading, Consideration Postponed."

Geo-Karis: "That's because...no it wasn't postponed that was, it was on the user list and...ah...it passed and then a number of... about 7 or 8 people took their votes off..."

Byers: "But it failed to pass at one time?"

Geo-Karis: "After that, yes."

Byers: "Okay, thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Will."



Bradley: "She indicates she'll yield."

Greiman: "Ah...I notice that this came from the Executive Committee. Now while I have no...ah...quarrel over that I suppose. Isn't this the kind of thing that normally would be...ah...within the...ah... purview of scope and scope of the Higher Education Committee? Ah..."

Geo-Karis: "Representative I had no...ah...nothing to do in the original assignment of this Bill nor did I ever ask any of the assigning Representatives and they can tell you that I never did."

Greimen: "Well this is a Committee Bill though...This is not a Bill that was assigned."

Geo-Karis: "May...May I answer sir. It was originally assigned to the Executive Committee and after that it was on the Floor and it went on the user list..."

Bradley: "Pardon me Mrs. Geo-Karis....The Gentleman from Lake Mr. Matijevich on a Point of Order."

Matijevich: "I make the Point of Order that this...the assignment of the Bill to which Committee has nothing to do with the Bill and that the Gentlemans questioning is out of order."

Bradley: "Your point's well taken sir. Are there any more questions? Mr. Greiman?"

Greiman: "I'm out of order. so apparently there isn't."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker would the Sponsor yiled to a question?"

Bradley: "She indicates that she will."

Brinkmeier: "I think I'm in complete support of this...of the Bill But I'm a little confused with the Digest and with your explanation. Did I understand you to say that we are removing the State Superintendent of Public Instruction?"

Geo-Karis: "No....I He is...I think the new title of this is the Superintendent of Public Instruction."

Brinkmeier: "Okay, just changed the title. All right thank you."

Bradley: "All right, the question is..."

Geo-Karis: "The Digest is wrong in that."

Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The..."



Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Kozubowski 'aye'. The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', 3 'nos', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3076, 3078."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3078. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Metro-East Sanitary District Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to consider House Bills 3078, 3079, 3080, and 3081 together, as they are four Bills that all really companion Bills, and...ah...affect the same thing."

Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave? The Clerk will read 3079, 3080, and 3081."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3079. A Bill for an Act to create Sanitary District in certain locations. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3080. A Bill for an Act to amend the Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3081. A Bill for an Act to amend the Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Act, of the House, the reason there are four Bills here, and they're being considered together is that due to the construction of the Act, it is necessary to have two Bills to affect the change that these Bills attempt to effect, and since the Act was amended and will soon become, as a result of a...of legislative action last Session, the Metro-East Act of 1974 is necessary to have two Bills to amend that Act, depending on when if this became effective it would take effect. So that's the reason it's necessary to have the four Bills. All these Acts do and I've had this researched by the Illinois Legislative Council, and this is the only sanitary district that we can find in the State of Illinois that does not have a method, a statutory method of disconnection within the Act. Both the Northshore Sanitary District Act and the present Chicago Sanitary Act has methods of disconnection. This legislation in these Bills put that exact same method of disconnection into the Metro-east Sanitary District, and provide that with the ten



percent of those in the area wishing to disconnect, a filing of petition with the Circuit Court and the Court finding the petition to be correct, and the circumstances correct in accordance with the legislation, they would then have a referendum. And if that referendum carried then that area would be allowed to disconnect. This is in exact accordance with the Northshore Sanitary District Act as it now exists, and the Chicago Sanitary District Act, and I would ask for your favorable vote to pass these Bills."

Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to these Bills, for two very important reasons. First of all, I can't understand how this is coming out as a Committee Bill in Cities and Villages. It was heard in Counties and Townships. It was defeated in Counties and Townships. A Motion to Discharge was defeated on the Floor of the House, and now here it is as a Committee Bill from Cities and Villages. I think that this is wrong. I think it makes a mockery out of our committee system. And I think another very important reason for defeating this legislation is the fact that in the last Session of the General Assembly, you all remember, the testimony that was given in this House, and the horrendous example of..."

Bradley: "Pardon me Mrs. Stiehl. To our guest in the gallery, we prohibit the taking of pictures. Proceed Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is the most, this Eastside levy and sanitary district has historically been the most horrendous example of government that has completely broken down in this entire country. Now last year, legislation was passed, in an effort to bring some semblance of order and good government out of the chaotic condition that exist down there. A referendum was held in November. It was approved by the people, and before it was ever allowed to be placed into affect, we are here at this time considering new legislation. I think this is very wrong and another very important consideration is the fact that history has shown that there has never been a system of checks and balances in that Eastside levy district. Now last year, we provided for majority, minority representation on that board and I think that it's important that we see that the legislation that was passed here last



year be allowed to work. Thank you. I'd ask for a no vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of these four Bills. This is permissive legislation. It restores local control where it should be. It permits the people of this area, our area, to select their own district, and I certainly solicit your favorable vote on these four Bills. Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, if he would yield?"

Bradley: "He indicates that he will yield."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Calvo, you, as you know, your conversation in your Bills always intrigue me a great deal. You mean to tell me that there's no way for your district to disconnect from this now?"

Calvo: "Absolutely none."

VanDuyne: "Were you here when this thing was formed?"

Calvo: "No, it was formed in 1907 Leroy, and it was the only, it's the only one in the State of Illinois that doesn't have a method of disconnection."

VanDuyne: "One other question Representative Calvo, how did you vote on the RTA? ha,ha,ha,ha."

Calvo: "I voted for it."

VanDuyne: "For the disconnect I mean. How did you vote for House Bill 3078?"

Calvo: "I probably voted for that too, Leroy, I don't remember."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Farley."

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no', the 'ayes', have it. Does the Gentleman wish to close, if not. The Gentleman wishes to close. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Spe.."

Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. Calvo, the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfield on a Point of Order."

Hirschfield: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me correctly, even



though the Republican's were not on the Floor of this House at the time the user list was...ah...was dealt with so surreptitiously I think there was a...you'll get with it...ah...Representative Giorgi in a few years. Ah...I think that tha...tha...that the Speaker did make a decision, however, that those Bills had to be re-referred to the Committee from whence they came, and since this Bill was in Counties and Townships and was not re-referred to that Committee, it seems to me that it is improperly before this Body at this time, and I would ask a ruling on that point."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "It was referred to ah...to the Committee on Cities and Villages, Mr. Speaker, and I think that was the decision made by the Committee on Assignments."

Bradley: "The...in respond to your inquiry Sir, the Bills were properly posted, so in the Chair's opinion, we are...ah...that the subject matter was properly assigned, so we should be considering House Bill 3078, as we are Sir. Mr. Hirschfield?"

Hirschfield: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask you a question whether the Bill was properly posted or properly assigned, but at the time we asked to have those Bills re-referred on the Floor of this House, the permanent Speaker was in that Chair, and a Member of this Body from one side of the aisle or the other asked to have his Bill referred to a Committee other than the Committee from which it came, and the Speaker specifically asked the question, was that the Committee from which this Bill emerged, and he replied it was not, and the Speaker said it must be referred only to the Committee of origin, and so the fact that its been properly posted and properly heard in the wrong committee is immaterial."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from ah...Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Point of Order."

Bradley: "State your point, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I think I have a memory about that discussion, and maybe it's because I'm on the Floor more than Representative Hirschfield, I don't know, but I recall that discussio...ha,ha,ha...that discussion...ah... happened to surround itself upon the issue of whether one has to have notice or not and whether a Committee can come out with a Committee



Bill that is not exactly like a Bill that has...that had been priorly introduced. And if it...and if it had been a Committee initiated Bill relative to the notice, that's what the Speaker was talking about at that particular time as I recall, Representative Hirschfield."

Bradley: "The Gentleman's point is well taken, and Mr. Hirschfield's point is not well taken. The question is, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyers, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker,...ah...that was my Motion that I made late in the evening, and I read it from a piece of paper, I believe, the temporary parliamentarian typed out himself, and it was to recommit all Bills to the respective committee of origin. It's on the Record Mr. Speaker. It's in the Transcript. I don't, I would suggest that at least you would take this Bill out of the record."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the man, the Gentleman that just spoke isn't speaking to the point. These matters were posted one week before the Committee met as new matters, to be...to be heard at that Committee hearing, and these Bills came out of that Committee as new Bills."

Bradley: "The point is well taken. The question is, shall these Bills pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Madison to explain his vote."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, just to talk briefly to the point's raised by the charming Lady from the other side of the aisle, these Bills were posted twice for public hearing, and not one witness appeared against them. This does not affect the referendum held in November. The Bills are drawn so that they would amend that new Act, and will provide only this method of statutory disconnection that is now in the other sanitary district legislation before that we operate under in the State of Illinois, the Act of 1917, the Northshore Sanitary District Act and the Chicago Act, and all we're asking is to give us that same opportunity that if either area or any area desires a disconnection that they have the statutory right to petition the Court, and a referendum, and if they're successful in passing a referendum,





they have that right. I ask your favorable vote to put this sanitary district on a par with the rest of them in the estate, in the State of Illinois. Apparently, the only reason it isn't that way now is that in 1907 they hadn't started doing it yet, and the one's formed since then do have this in the Act. I do not think it's unreasonable to ask for this. I don't see any problem, it does not affect the structure of the trustees, it does not affect the other Bill, because two of the Bills in this series would amend the Bill as it was passed by the General Assembly and voted upon by the people the last time, and I would appreciate a few more green lights, please."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can agree with Representative Calvo that there should be some system for providing a...ah...disconnect, but I think that these Bills are untimely, from the standpoint, I was the Chief Sponsor of the Bill last year, that changed the old Act to the Metro-east Sanitary District Act, and it has not had an opportunity to work, and does not become effective until next year, and they...because the reason for that was, that we could not, we thought we could not legislate people out of office that were duly elected to office. and I think these Bills are untimely to say the least."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos wish to explain his vote? The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, to explain her vote."

Stiehl: "Ah...can we have the Roll Call now?"

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco, to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise, of course, in support of this Bill once again, and I rise to explain my vote. This, to me, is somewhat similar, yet opposite to consolidation of schools. There has to be a method, a means of format by which these various districts, regardless of what type they might be, can organize and consolidate. So in this case, we're simply asking for a format to be laid out. A program to lay out by which the people of any particular area, and of course we're speaking of the Metro-East area, may disconnect



themselves from any other district, if they so see fit. I certainly would urge to you to give us an 'aye' vote on these Bills."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 85 'ayes', 45 'nos', the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have a poll of the absentees, please."

Bradley: "Poll the absentees, please."

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

Bradley: "Present."

O'Brien: "Bluthardt, Campbell, Carroll, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell."

Bradley: "Ewell votes present."

O'Brien: "Fleck, Friedland, Grotberg, Katz, Klosak, LaFleur, Leinenweber, Madison."

Bradley: "Madison votes present. Fleck wants to be recorded as voting 'no'.

O'Brien: "McAvoy, Molloy, Porter, Rose, Schlickman, Sevcik, Wall, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "On this question there are 85 'ayes', 50 'nos', 19 voting 'present'. These Bills having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority are hereby declared lost. House Bill 3084."

O'Brien: "House Bill 3084. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to States Attorneys and Assistant States Attorneys. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill formerly had a number number, another number that was lost during the shuffle on May 23, and has now been assigned a Committee number. It's a very simple Bill. The president of the State's Attorney's Association appeared before the Committee representing the ah...State's Attorneys of the State of Illinois and what this Bill does is it gives the States Attorney the right as to how many assistants he should have and what salaries to be paid in the criminal, civil and...ah...other divisions in the State's Attorneys Office. The County Board sets the budget. He must live within the budget and must report to the County Board on all of his assistants and his salaries. The...ah...other employees in the Department are regulated by the



Committees of the County. I would appreciate your support on this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Sponsor if he would?"

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Borchers: "Now as I understand this Bill, the State's Attorney can designate how many assistants he has and their salaries. Is that correct? Is that correct?"

Bradley: "Turn Mr. Schoeberlein on."

Schoeberlein: "This is dependent on the work in the particular department, and whether the high crime rate, naturally, he's got to get good criminal lawyers, sometimes like in our county, he cannot get them in the county, and he's got to go into a neighboring county, because they wouldn't work for the salaries that the County Board wanted to pay them."

Borchers: "In other words, the answer is yes, he can. Now suppose the County Board doesn't want to go along with it. What then?"

Schoeberlein: "Well, you're getting very poor service out of the State's Attorneys Office."

Borchers: "Well, look, if I may speak to the Bill a minute, since I've been.."

Bradley: "Proceed Sir."

Borchers: "I've been for twelve years in the past on a County Board, like many of us here. I feel this is an infringement upon the rights of the County Board. I think the County Board should be able to retain these rights in their own hands and make the decision as to the number of assistant state's attorneys, as proven by the need, proven to the Board by the State's Attorney himself. And also in regard to the financial condition of the county. This just gives an unlimited hand, in my opinion, to the State's Attorney."

Schoeberlein: "Well, it is just like it is down here. We have one lawyer on the County Board and all the rest of them are not members of the legal profession. but they know more about the State's Attorneys Office than the lawyers themselves do, and I don't think it's the proper way to operate a States Attorneys Office."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I guess I was one of the very few in Committee that did oppose this Bill at the time it was presented. It seems to me that in matters of budgeting for a county, the County Board is the one that is charged with that responsibility. Now, I personally witnessed a little whiplashing that takes place in County Government when, first of all, an elected official comes in and tells you how much he's overworked, and ask for more help and then after he gets some more help, as this would allow, he would then get a bigger budget and then would have the prerogative of laying off one or two of those people and paying more to those that are remaining. I think we've got to leave budgetary matters of this kind in the hands of the County Board. That's where they belong. We don't allow this, we don't extend this privilege to County Clerks, and County Treasurers...ah...I don't see why we should make this kind of exception for the State's Attorney. I think this request if unreasonable."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, I feel this question has been adequately debated, I move the previous question."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein, wish to close?"

Schoeberlein: "I won't say much more. I'd appreciate your support to help the State's Attorneys outside of Cook County, this excludes the home rule county, and it is for them to run an efficient office and, naturally, they collect a lot of money that is turned back to the county. I would appreciate your support."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 3084 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMasters to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. I intended to ask some questions of the Sponsor before hand, but I think we can do it through explanation of vote. It is my understanding that this piece



of legislation does not change the budgetary process. The County Board will still set the total budget for the State's Attorneys Office. Presently the Board also sets the number of assistants the State's Attorney has. Now, under current law, this might mean that a State's Attorney would have a half-a-dozen assistants, all paid under the budget, approved by the County Board and the number of assistants, approved by the County Board. Under this legislation, the State's Attorney would have the blanket authority to spend all of that money on one assistant, if he so desires. It gives him complete control of his budget within his office. I'm not sure how other elected county officials work, but I believe that most of them have control of the budget within their office, and control of the salaries. I think the Bill could really be done without, and I think that we can get along pretty much with what we're doing now. I don't think it's a necessary Bill, and I see no effect upon the budgeting powers of County Board, which ever way this piece of legislation goes."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevec, do you wish to explain your vote, Sir?"

Matijevec: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...I...I know why they put the Home Rule Amendment on it, to get the support of Cook County, and I would hope those in Cook County ought to lay off this vote, because you don't know what you're doing to us outside of your county. If it's so good, take the Home Rule Amendment off of it, and have it apply to your county too. I think that rightfully so, the present law is the way it should be. That the County Board ought to be the determining budget authority and determine the salary's of the...of the assistants. I don't think that ought to be in the hands of the State's Attorney, and I really think that if you want to operate government logically. that it ought to be in the hands of the County Board. That's the property, the proper authority. I've got a Republican County Board, I've got a Republican State's Attorney too, and...ah...but I really think that it's just logic that it belong in the hands of the County Board, and I would appreciate a no vote."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuayne, to explain his vote."

VanDuayne: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I would plead with you to give this some second thought...ah...I spent ten years on the County Board and I watched State's Attorneys come in to the County Board Finance Committee time after time after time and beg for more budgeting. Ah...Then, because they do have control over thier...ah...thier budget they don't have a line by line item and they do, they do lay these people off and then come back after a short period of time be moaning at the fact that they don't have help...ah...In the days of the close financial budgetting that we had here, especially in our County...ah...We don't have the money... ah...I just think this is very irresponsible voting and like Mr. Matijevich said, If the people only knew what they were doing to the downstate counties...ah...they'd change their vote and I would urge you and plead with you to give us a red vote on this thing."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Borchers, do you wish to explain your 'no' vote?"

Borchers: "Just one thing. You...you...you must think of what you're doing to the down...the downstate counties. Here we are again interfering with the right of local control and we shouldn't do it. It's a very bad Bill."

Bradley: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 80 'ayes', 41 'no' 19 voting 'present' this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 3092."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3092..."

Bradley: "I'm sorry. 3091."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3091. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you really want to do something for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, you will vote for House Bill 3091. If you want to do something as far as saving money for the taxpayers, you will vote for House Bill 3091. Because the "guesstimate" is that this Bill will save



the taxpayers annually something between...between ten and eight-teen millions of dollars..."

Bradley: "Mr. Choate, we'll try to get some order here. Could we give the Gentleman some order please."

Choate: "I realize that everyone is anxious to get out of the House because you have your Republican meeting and we Democrats want to go eat while you're enjoying your fund raiser. However, this Bill will save the taxpayers somewhere between ten and eight-teen millions of dollars annually. It will cause greater voter participation because we're talking about consolidating the elections in the State of Illinois. It will provide one polling place, it will cut the spring elections like School Board Elections, Park District Elections and all of these other elections like we have six, seven or eight, nine of them sometimes in a two month period. It will cut them down to three elections a year on one year and two elections a year on the other year. I'm saying to you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that if you want to take a giant step forward and reform, in election reform in the State of Illinois, at the same time, bring about a savings to the taxpayer, a greater voter participation, you will overwhelmingly pass House Bill 3091."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Fredrich."

Fredrich: "The, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Fredrich: "What elections do this consolidate Mr. Choate?"

Choate: "It consolidates all of them."

Fredrich: "In other words, you're throwing the township elections, the city elections, the school elections and everything in with the Presidential election, right?"

Choate: "Two Elections in the even year and three elections..."

Fredrich: "What elections."

Choate: "In the odd numbered year."

Fredrich: "What elections?"

Choate: "Okay, I'll, I'll tell ya. In the even years in May you



would have the general primary for national offices, state offices, county offices and the election for political party offices. In November, you would have the general elections for national offices, state offices, county offices and Judicial retention and that's just practically, well it is identical to the present election statutes that you have today."

Fredrich: "Are you saying township elections would be combined with the Presidential Election?"

Choate: "No...Now wait just a minute, I'll get to your township...ah... Dwight. In the odd years, in March, you would consolidate the primary, you would have the judges, the municipal, township, highway commissioners, road district and road district clerks. In May, you would have the Judges...the election pardon, that would be the primary in March and the election in May. In November you would have the nonpartisan election such as your school districts, special districts and nonpartisan elections only."

Fredrich: "I think I'd like to speak on the Bill."

Bradley: "Proceed sir."

Fredrich: "Mr. Speaker, it...As I've mentioned, I think when such a matter was up not very long ago. It was thought to be a big deal by the delegates of the Constitutional Convention that we separate elections so that there would not be a coattail effect on some popular guy running for President who'd sweep in all the County Candidates and the Governors and so on, regardless of which way it went. So, as you know, we have a, we're putting the state officers on the off year from the Presidential Election beginning...ah..in 1978. Now to me it makes as much sense, certainly, to elect the Governor when you elect the President, than it does a County Board Member when you're electing a Governor. Actually what we ought to be doing here instead of what's being proposed is to put the County elections and the Township elections in one thing, because they're strictly local in nature. We have no business combining county offices and particularly County Board Members with a Governors election. Now this may save money but it's not good government because those other elections are strictly local elections and I think people on both sides of the aisle will live to be sorry for it, if you've got a pop...





we have to have a popular candidate for Governor that sweeps your County Board out of office, you're not going to like it any better than we are the other way and it just plain isn't right.

This is a bad Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins. Here he comes. Taking up some of your time."

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor of this Bill full...knows well that no one favors consolidation of elections more than I and have attempted to work with him in the Election Laws Commission to attain this goal. However, we have been working or attempting to work with the Municipal League to work out not...not only a consolidated schedule, this schedule is the one which we in the Election Laws Commission would propose be incorporated in the new code. However, I would point out to all of you who are interested in your own municipal elections, in your township elections, that you no longer will administer them, you will no longer control them because all powers in administration will reside in the County Clerk. Now I submit that this is not a good idea, there are powers that must reside in a County Clerk, but I know that most municipalities and most townships will want to run their own elections and should be allowed to continue to do so. So reluctantly I have to rise to...to oppose this Bill. I personally have met with Representative of the Municipal League and I have told them that I want consolidation of elections very badly as...as badly as Representative Choate does. But I also want to see them reach some accommodations so that they still will have the control over their own elections at least in matters that are strictly administrative. So I think that we are premature, it's not, it certainly is not Representative Choate's fault. He has attempted to move this thing along. There has been foot dragging and I...I think that there's some foot dragging on the part of the Municipal League, but we want to do this job right because it's an important job and I do think that we should wait on this. I know in the Senate that the...the



consolidate...the new code is...is still waiting in the Senate it was thought that between now and the Fall Schedule the...ah... Election Laws Commission and all the interested parties could work on the new code and hopefully would work out a compromise on this most important Article in that code, this matter of consolidation of elections. I like the time table that is proposed here. But I do think that we are a long way from agreement as to powers and administration and so reluctantly I would ask all Members to vote 'no' on the Bill at this time."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to one question?"

Bradley: "He indicates that he would."

Brinkmeier: "Clyde, I was trying to listen to your explanation a moment ago. I want to be very sure. Do you include the school elections in this proposal?"

Choate: "They're in...They're included on a separate day of nonpolitical elections."

Brinkmeier: "Okay. Well thank you. Mr. Speaker, if I may very briefly."

Bradley: "Proceed sir."

Brinkmeier: "In the last municipal election in Freeport, Illinois, which happens to be the largest city in the...in the 35th Legislative District, the breakdown was the cost of five dollars and seventy-two cents per voter that went to the polls. Now, the...obviously because of the qualified voters, they had to print up sixteen thousand plus ballots. We found out that only fourteen hundred bothered to go to the polls to vote that day. That's plus all the other costs added up to this tremendous cost. I think the City of Rockford was somewhere in that same vicinity. Now I don't believe that I... personally I would prefer not to have the school elections included in there but they're nonpolitical maybe that's not so bad. I would think that as Representative Choate has pointed out, if we consider the tremendous tax savings to...to our people back home I don't think there's anyway to vote except green on this Bill and I certainly hope that you all do so."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."



Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I will reluctantly arise to speak against this Bill because I too, as Representative Collins has mentioned, have taken a position in favor of consolidated elections and have voted to permit consolidated elections wherever possible. However, there's a practical problem that stands in the way of accomplishing what...ah...the Sponsor of this Bill would like to do and that's called, Special Taxing Districts, who's boundries are not coterminous with anything including precincts with...including other Special Taxing Districts. Now I happen to come from an area where the taxing districts are very diverse. In my precinct I have three separate...ah...fire protection districts. I've got two municipalities as well as an unincorporated area. It would be a nightmare for the election authority, the County Clerk, to put this election together. Now Representative Choate is going to respond by saying that we have two or four years in which to do this and I think that's admirable. However, I think we're taking a giant step ahead of something that ought to precede this particular Bill and that is an appropriation to the State Board of Elections to identify each parcel of land as to a voting address and identifying it as to which spas...special it ins...it's in, so that when the time comes to vote, the voter will be able to present evidence to the judges of elections and get the appropriate ballots for that particular taxing district. I have to emphasize. I don't disagree with what Representative Choate is doing. I support it. But I think we're putting this cart ahead of the horse. That we ought to provide the mechanics to accomplish this before we actually mandate this. So I therefore, reluctantly, do not support this Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, I'm afraid that the 'no's' have it. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."



Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had just...a couple of quick questions by way of clarification and points maybe I did miss. If the Sponsor will yield to a question."

Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Dunn: "All right. Are there any partisan elections combined with any non-partisan elections under this Bill?"

Choate: "Absolutely not."

Dunn: "And with regard to the..ah...point raised by the previous speaker. Does the Bill address itself to the problem of the fringes of the boundries of special districts which may find themselves...ah...in one election district and out of another depending upon who lives where. Do you address yourself to this problem in this Bill?"

Choate: "It certainly does. It certainly does address itself to that problem and actually Representative Kempiners said. Because we have only that one that would possibly, only the one election that would possibly, could possibly...ah...be involved as far as district lines are concerned and there's adequate amount of time involved that anyone should be able to set up the mechanics in this computerized age that we live in today to bring a...an adequate and honest and forthright election."

Dunn: "Well...ah...to continue, I don't know, I'm not really prepared to list all the districts in my area that may overlap...."

Choate: "What I really meant with that. Representative Dunn, is that the effective date of the Bill is not in aft...until after the General Election of 1976. So this cer...certainly should give anyone...ah...absolute the maximum amount of time to...ah...do the things that is necessary to bring about the...the...an adequate election."

Dunn: "If I may then speak to the ...to the...ah...to the Bill. Ah... I'm in a quandry as Representative Kempiners indicated, because I have no faith that in my area the...the people in...within two or three or four years will...ah...adjust the boundries of the various governmental units which operate in my area. I know there are some areas that in the local where I live where people are in



one school district and in another, and in one municipality and there are people in the same district in...school district in other municipalities and I suspect that they are going to be quite reluctant to remove themselves from one district and place themselves in another, just to consolidate elections and I too support the concept of...of this Bill and...ah...I really wish that there was some way that we could...ah...bring this concept to focus on the problem which...ah...which has slowed this matter down for so many years and that is the...ah...the maddening problem to the County Clerks and the election officials and...ah...I think that...ah...that if we pass this Bill we may find ourselves doing something that we will live to regret at this time."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Meyers."

Meyers: "I move the previous question Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, to close."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First let me express my, the first part of my remarks to my very learned young friend from Decatur. Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn, there has been statewide candidates for office of both political parties, district candidates for office of both political parties that have addressed themselves to this question from since day one. They have promised the people of this state that. yes, we're going to have election reform. They have promised the people of this state that, yes, we're going to have consolidation of elections and no one yet has ever addressed themselves to the extent that we have taken positive action in this Legislature. You can't roll the wagon unless you put the wheels on it and I want to put the wheels on the first move to bring about election reform in the State of Illinois and I'll tell you something else. They talk about the Municipal League, working it out with them. the Elections Commission has been working for years and hasn't come up and this



is the thing that they have been addressing themselves to. There was not one single solitary member of the Municipal League that came to the Committee and addressed themselves adversely to this Bill. Not a single, solitary person. If they opposed it, where were they? I don't think they oppose it. They have not told me they opposed it and I've talked to them. I'm saying to you, that this is your opportunity to take the first step to keep our pledges to the people of this state. Bring about election reform, bring about participation in the election and quit bitching about the people not going to the poll. I encourage your vote."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 3091 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. ...ah...I notice for many years that I've been here that the Membership always likes to vote for popular issues. Those issues in which the people in thier districts feel strongly about and...I... from my going along to districts for many years, this is one of the most popular issues that I know of. Now a couple years back they said that we consolidated elections with the county, county board, with the general elections, it couldn't be done. It wouldn't work and it has worked. If there's one thing that people are sick and tired of, it's so many elections. This not only saves money, it puts the elections...it consolidates the elections the people have the intelligence to vote on issues, they can separate the issues as to local issues and others so we get enough votes. It's a good Bill."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to explain his vote."

Darrow: "I see that this Bill will no doubt pass. Down in my area of the state it's called the Choate reform Bill. I see that the Committee on Elections is taking credit now, I hope the Chicago newspapers also call it the Choate reform Bill. Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Fredrich, to explain his vote."



Fredrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Sponsor of this Bill said that he was putting wheels on it. I'd say he's putting skids on it and it's down hill all the way. Now let me tell you that this sounds good on paper. Reform, all... everybody always jumps to get on something that says reform, the newspaper likes reform, the politicians like reform, but you better look at what you're voting at. Now let me tell you, Mr. Dunn expressed something which is true in my are. The city of Centralia has five school districts. They do not conform to township lines, they do con...in fact the City of Centralias in two counties. Now you're really creating a mess here and you better look at some of the situations in your own district, because you're going to have to live with this."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster to explain his vote. He doesn't wish to. Mr. Skinner, wish to explain your 'yes' vote sir?"

Skinner: "I don't rise to explain my last... 'yes' vote Mr. Speaker. I rise to than Representative Choate."

Bradley: "Oh...I'm sure he appreciates it. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes' 22 'no's', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3092."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3092. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I should be a..."

Bradley: "Pardon me Mr. Choate. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh arise?"

Walsh: "Well to ask if we can't adjourn Mr. Speaker. The Republicans have a social function from 6 to 8 we're 25 minutes late now. Now I don't think that was asking too much to have two hours off for that purpose during the dinner hour. You're just postponing the dinner hour."

Bradley: "That's...."



Walsh: "Why can't we leave now and take this Bill when we get back."

Bradley: "That seems to be a legitimate request and we're going to work to 6:30..."

Walsh: "It's damn reasonable....We're getting to a Bill that's controversial to say the least. Why don't we leave now. I move that we adjourn...recess for two hours..."

Bradley: "I didn't recognize you for that purpose sir..."

Walsh: "Two and a half hours."

Bradley: "House Bill 3092. Mr. Choate."

Choate: "I...Mr. Speaker, would know that it be sure folly to ask for the same Roll Call on this Bill. So I as the chief Sponsor of 3092 am going to accede to the Assistant Maj... ah...ah...ah...Minority Leaders request and hope you have a lot of fun and then give me some help when you get back."

Bradley: "It seems as though we're being awfully nice to those people on that side. Mr. Shea...Before we recognize Mr. Shea there is....The Gentleman from Cook. The Majority Leader, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now stand in recess for five minutes and then let the Clerk read in the...ah...some Committee Reports from the Senate and then that the House stand in recess until the hour of 8:30."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House recess for five minutes and then adjourn until...recess then until 8:00 this evening..."

Shea: "8:30."

Bradley: "8:30. All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed 'no'. It was close. The 'aves' have it. We stand recessed."

Jack O'Brien: "Committee Reports. Mr. Boyle from the Appropriations II Committee to which Senate Bill 471 and 989 were referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended, do pass. Mr. Maragos, from the Committee on Revenue, to which House Bill 2303 and 2305 were referred reports the same back in pursuant to Rule 23(d), the Bills were ordered tabled. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which was referred House Resolution 61





reported the same back with the recommendation the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which was referred House Resolution 267 reported the same back with the recommendation the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee which was referred House Resolution 314, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which was referred House Resolution 363, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee to which was referred House Resolution 367, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted. Mr. Matijevich from the Executive Committee which was referred House Resolution Constitutional Amendment #33 reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution do pass. Mr. Katz from the Committee on Rules to which House Bill 3118 was referred reports the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Katz from the Committee on Rules to which was referred House Resolution 237 reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution be adopted."

Bradley: "Messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1795. Passed by the Senate June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title of passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill 635. Passed by the Senate June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2047 together with Amendment, passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr.



Wright Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1935. Together with Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended. June 19, 1975.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1949, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975,

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1821, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2872. Together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: "House Bill 2780, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2768, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary



JUN 19 1975

196.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2740, together with Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975 Kenneth Wright, Secretary.....A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2708, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2706, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2704, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2574, together with an Amendmend. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2392. Together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2384, together



with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate be Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurs with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2286, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2237, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2216. Together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2207, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2182, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2157, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.



JUN 19 1975

198.

A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2155, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 1988, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1917, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended. June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1916, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1807, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1782, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended. June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform



the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1754, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1586, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1531, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1503, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1482, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1479, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright,



Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1446, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1423, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1420, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1408, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1392, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1375, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate



JUN 19 1975

201.

has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1371, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1352, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1284, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 1166, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 970, together with an Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 405, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of





Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 115, together with Amendments Passed by the Senate as amended, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House or Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 102, together with Amendment. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 29, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further Messages. Mr. Katz... Committee Reports. Mr. Katz from the Committee on Rules to which House Bill 3118 was referred, reports the same back with the recommendation that the Bill is passed out of Committee as an emergency matter necessary for the operation of State Government."

Bradley: "We'll now recess...The House will stand in recess until 8:30."

Doorkeeper: "All those not entitled to the Floor, will you please retire to the Gallery."

Doorkeeper: "All those not entitled to the Floor, will you please retire to the Gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "Trying to take good care of you. I really apologize, I had intended to go, but...I was there...I did already.....The Order of business. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 296."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 296. Kornowicz. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz here? Take that one out of the record. I guess we'll back up and try an Agreed Resolution, see if we can get those Sponsors here."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 372. Greiman, et al. House Resolution 374. Madigan, et al. House Resolution...

Oh, that's 373 is Greiman. 374, Madigan. 376, Anderson.

House Resolution 377. Reed. House Resolution 378. Leverenz



et al. House Resolution 379, Fary et al. House Resolution 381,  
Molloy et al. House Resolution 382, Schraeder."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevecich."

Matijevecich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 373, congratulates the Indians of Niles West High School. House Resolution 374. Commends and congratulates the L.F.K. Lituanica Lithuanian Soccer Club. House Resolution 376 extends its congratulations to the Holy Family Church of Ogelsby, Illinois on its 75th Anniversary. House Resolution 377, commends the Revilares Drill Team from Round Lake, Illinois. House Resolution 378...ah...commends the Director of the Chicago zoological Park at Brookfield, Illinois. House Resolution 379...we extend our congratulations to Reverend Lewis E. Novak on his anniversary of 45 years as a Roman Catholic priest. House Resolution 381 commends Kenton E. Stevens, upon the many contributions which he has made to the cause of education in Oak Park, Illinois. House Resolution 382, commends Ms. Ann C. Gotschalck upon her 43 years of service to the youth of Illinois as an Elementary School Teacher. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the adoption of the agreed Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 375. Respect to the memory of the Honorable Mark Jones of Carlinville."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevecich moves to adopt the Death Resolution. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolution is adopted. Any further Resolutions? "

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 380. Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment...Okay, will you give the Chair your undivided attention we have a very important bit of information to pass on. We have the numbers of the weekly lottery in case anybody is interested in them. Come up...get your..."



cards out and we'll call off the numbers. 5, 39, 30, 09,  
21. Weekly Bonanza and Millionaire. 450, 256, 213.

Representative Kosinski is tearing up his ticket, Resolution."

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 66. Shea. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein. That the two Houses meet in Joint Session in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday, June 23, 1975, at the Hour of 11:00 A.M. for the purpose of hearing an address by Captain Eugene A. Cernan, United States Navy. Commander of Apollo 17."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich has moved the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolution is adopted. Any further Resolutions? Senate Bills, Third Reading. On Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 449. Representative Kelly. Take that out of the record? 641. Representative McClain. He's not here. We'll take that out of the record. 669. 665. Okay. We'll take 665. Representative Meyer."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 665. Meyer. A Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Building Revenue Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, this increases the interest rate on bonds issued by Industrial Building Authorities from 6 to 8 per cent. Permits the...the purchase of options of Real Estate Buildings in there, and I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Meyer: "Yes Sir."

Schraeder: "According to the Digest, it says it permits bonds to be issued without submitting any proposition to the electorate by referendum. Is that correct?"

Meyer: "These are Revenue Bonds, and they don't need to have a referendum."

Schraeder: "Revenue Bonds. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass? All in favor



vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?

The Clerk will take the Record. Whoops. Have all voted who wished?

The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, 109 'ayes', 2 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 669."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 669. Meyer. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This Bill amends the Public Aid Code and makes sure that the Public Aid Department cannot collect from emancipated children. Those children who have left home. Senator Catania...sh...Representative Catania's Amendment said that it did not provide for children who are going to school on...in...what this Amendment does, it says that the Public Aid Department can continue to collect for children who have left home."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor shall vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 125 'ayes', 3 'nays', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 699."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 699, Mudd."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd on the Floor?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd. 699"

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill was used as a bargaining Bill for the Downstate firemen, and they had a Bill drafted. Amendment #1, I'd like leave to take this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection. Leave is granted, and it will be returned to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment."

O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Mudd. Amend Senate Bill 699 on page 1, lines 1 and 5 by deleting Section 4-111, and so forth."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."



Mudd: "Just briefly,...ah...for the Members, this particular Amendment is the Bill now. It was negotiated with the members of the Downstate Fire Departments, with the Pension Board, and with the Taxpayers Federation, and it's agreed by the Chairman of the Pension Commission is...ah...in agreement with it, and I would ask for the House's concurrence in Amendment #1 of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah...yes, would the Sponsor of this Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Representative Mudd...ah...I haven't had a chance to read this, but what, is there anything in the Amendment that you are proposing now that was in the form of another Bill that was defeated in the Pension Committee?"

Mudd: "No, Representative Ebbesen. A lot of these Bills were Bills that we passed through the Pension Committee and the parties involved were notified or told that there was not sufficient funding to take care of these additional benefits that they asked for. That the Bills would be killed on the Floor, and this is why they negotiated with the two and a quarter percent payment to cover some of these benefits."

Ebbesen: "One other question...ah...the ...ah...is there any fiscal impact as far as state money is concerned, as far as the Amendment is concerned?"

Mudd: "No, a Fiscal Note as far as this particular Bill is not applicable because there's no state monies involved, it's all local money."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 699. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye, "aye", the opposed 'no', "no", the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

O'Erien: "Amendment #2, Terzich. Amend Senate Bill 699 as amended by deleting third paragraph of Section 4-110.1, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 simply...ah...states that under the disability benefit that is included in this Bill, that the maximum amount payable would



ah...be that amount that is paid under the plan less any monies that are made to other employment, not to exceed a hundred percent of what the current earnings of the firemen in that particular class is, and I would urge adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of Amendment #2, to Senate Bill 699. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 700. Representative Farley on the Floor? Take it out of the Record. 701. Representative McClain? 703. Representative Lundy?"

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 703. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 703 is a very simple Bill that is to...ah...authorize the Members of the General Assembly to use their contingent expense allowance to either...ah...utilize postage meters which are presently not approved by the Comptroller, or to eliminate problems in the utilization of bulk rate accounts with the Post Office. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Representative Lu...Mr. Speaker will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. State your question."

Lauer: "Representative Lundy, was...was this Bill not amended to...ah...ban the use of these monies for bulk mailings within a specified period before elections?"

Lundy: "It was not Representative Lauer, although I recall that you raised the question when the Bill was considered in the Executive Committee, and I can tell you why it was not. Number one, the appropriation Bill for contingent expense allowances each year, contains a prohibition on the use of any of that money for political purposes. Number two, Senator Schaffer, the Senate Sponsor of the



Bill indicated to me that...ah...on, at least, two occasions the Senate has rejected Bills which contained a similar prohibition, and therefore he...he was reluctant to incumber this Bill with that kind of prohibition because he felt it would kill the Bill on the Senate."

Lauer: "Representative, I know that you're a good legal beagle. Would it be your opinion, as an attorney, that the prohibition against the use of this political purposed, even if it was by inference, ah...would...ah...be upheld by the Attorney General's opinion and by the Court?" I realize that I'm throwing that at you fast Joe, but..."

Lundy: "I think it would depend on the content of the...of the newsletter if that's what you're thinking of it's being used in a newsletter."

Lauer: "I'm thinking of a newsletter or a questionnaire or, or something that would get an incumbent office holder's name before the voters...ah...shortly before an election to the point that it would conceively be an untoward abuse of the privilege."

Lundy: "All I can say, is that I think that it would depend upon the way the publication was written. Ah...I would point this out, however, that this Bill makes no change in the present law in the respect that you're concerned about. It doesn't permit or prohibit anything that isn't permitted or prohibited now. It simply allows a different means of paying for it, namely the use of a bulk rate account."

Lauer: "Thank you Representative Lundy. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I...ah...had...ah...wanted to ask a question of Ms...Representative Lundy before it started just to clarify it. It seems to me that the postage permit that we have available to us also would include postage metering and bulk mailing, and I just don't understand this, because what difference does postage metering or bulk mailing, as compared to the word postage in our allotment. I can't see where...where there, in other words are you...ah...might



say more explicitly defining the term postage or are we presently not allowed to use it for bulk mailing and that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House to explain my vote, I will attempt to respond to Representative Kelly. The point is Representative, some Members, not all, but some have encountered difficulty in having the Comptroller reimbursement them for out of pocket expenditures for bulk rate accounts and this would authorize direct payments into them, and also some Members have been told that they may not have postage meters paid for out of the contingent expense allowance."

Kelly: "It will be a pleasure to vote for this Bill."

Lundy: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, 114 'ayes', 4 'nay', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 733."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 733. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan. Representative Londrigan?"

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill provides that all petitions for nominations required to be filed with the State Board of Elections, be filed in the principal office. Now we have two offices. The time clocks are not the same, and we cannot ascertain who files first in the first minute and who files last in the last minute. So we're making it that all nomination petitions be filed in the principal office. It passed unanimously in the Senate and in both committees, and I ask your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Representative Katz, do you seek recognition?"

Katz: "I wanted to ask the Gentleman from Springfield, if he would be willing to flip a coin as to whether the place it would be filed would be in the Chicago office or the Springfield office?"





Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. This question 129 'ayes', 1 'nay', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 767? Representative McPartlin. Take that out of the Record. Senate Bill 805. Representative McMaster's here?"

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 805. A Bill for an Act to amend te Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMasters."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think Horace Calvo is on the other side of the aisle."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could you explain how we're proceeding down the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, we went through the list of the Bills that have received no negative votes in the Senate, committees, and Senate Floor and House committees, and that's what this is. We have another list in which they had two negative votes. Very similar to the Bill that we're..."

Madigan: "Well, why don't we just put them all together, and just take one Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telscer doesn't want to do that."

Telscer: "Ah...Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Redmond: "....Representative McMaster."

Telscer: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Telscer: "Just a point of parliamentary inquiry. While I have no objection at this moment with your procedure, aren't you violating the Rules that are going.....?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, I cleared with Representative Washburn. He said that it's alright. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 805 is a cleanup of a Bill that we fought around this General Assembly last Session for two years. Horace Calvo from the other side of the aisle and myself are probably the principal House proponents and exponents of the Bill. I would like to have Horace here when the Bill is called. If he is not here, I saw him earlier, I would rather that the



Bill was taken from the Record. But Horace and I and everyone else concerned have come to an agreement on it. 805 is a good Bill that is agreed on by everyone. The Environmental Protection Agency, the Pollution Control Board, The Environmental Quality Outfit. We have worked a long time on this Bill. Horace and I and all the people concerned when we heard it in Committee, we had Jake DeMeil here. We had the EPA here. We had the Environmental Quality Institute here. We're all in agreement on it. I would like to move the Bill, but I would like to have Horace here to support me when we move it. I would not do it otherwise."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 805 is indeed an old Bill that we've had around many times, and I'd be interested Tom, if you don't mind, explaining...ah...I have before me a statement of opposition by the Pollution Control Board, which indicates...ah...first off that it is not a Bill that they are satisfied with...ah...does not allow them...ah...to move quickly on health hazard problems...ah...they have to go back to a committee to do it...ah...they indicate already that this is provided for it the law as I have mentioned many times, as you know. So...ah...if the PCB is...ah...really in agreement with you, would you please explain to me at what point that agreement was reached, which Amendments you refer to that made that compatible with their point of view?"

McMaster: "Glen, I would be very happy too. This was secured with a Senate Amendment, I believe it was Senate Amendment #3. If I can read the language to you, Glen."

Schneider: "Thank you."

McMaster: "On page 8 of the Bill. When the Board finds that a severe public health emergency is involved in relation to any proposed regulation, it may provide that such regulation shall take effect without delay and permit the Board to proceed with the required hearings and studies while the regulations continue in effect."

Schneider: "Is there a section in the Bill...ah...that would relate to the



question of whether or not you need to have a study because it is provided for in the Environmental Protection Act. Remember I've argued and I think the Agency has always argued that there's been provision for economic impact statements within the law itself. Now your Bill addresses itself... thank you Mr. Speaker...addresses itself to that very question of whether or not. I mean, doesn't your Bill address itself to the very question of whether or not economic reasonableness is not already in the law?"

McMaster: "Yes, I think that we do Glen. Let me see if I can.."

Speaker Redmond: "Would the .....please break-up the caucus around Representative Telscer's desk."

Schneider: "I can't see the Sponsor because George Ryan is in the way, and Ms. Barnes is laughing too loud."

McMaster: "I'm trying to find the part Glen that you're questioning. You were saying that it was already in the law..."

Schneider: "Right, I'm saying that the EPA is already within the law... ah...language which will make economic impact studies. If that... if true, apparently it would be deleted from your Bill."

McMaster: "No, it would not Glen. I think what we are trying to do is strengthen that opportunity for the Commission that is created by this Bill to go back and call for what they decide should be, should have an environmental economic impact study upon it. This would be done by the committee set up by this Bill which would in turn report back to the Environmental Quality Institute, which would make a recommendation to the Pollution Control Board, which would then study it. If they decide in the process Glen, that this deserves a study and hearing they would so do. If they hold hearings and decide this problem, then there is no requirement for further hearings, but it all goes back to the Pollution Control Board, and Glen, we had Jake Demeil at the Committee hearing to testify in support of the Bill. We had people from the EPA to testify in support of it. Dick Brison was here. Sam Boyd, the Director of the Illinois Institute for Environmental Quality was here to testify in support of it."

Schneider: "Alright. One last question Tom, if you don't mind, and that



is, are we going to go back and review old regulations?

McMaster: "No, Glen."

Schneider: "Alright."

McMaster: "Glen, not all of them, selected ones. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 105 'ayes', 15 'nos', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 820. Representative Williams. 820."

O'Brien: "House Bill 820, Williams. A Bill for an Act creating the Water Resources Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman attention, please."

Williams: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House."

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

Kane: "Did you skip a couple of Bills on the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'm only taking the ones here that appear to be noncontroversial, because of the ..... I'll go back to those."

Kane: "Oh, because Representative Richmond had a Bill, I think."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'll go back. I'm just taking those that I thought we've had the least contest over. 820. Representative Williams."

Williams: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 820 is the same as the House Bill 1795, that Representative Madigan had, and this restructures the Water Pollution, Water Resources Commission. It shortens the name to Water Resources Commission. Makes a clarification when and by whom appointments are made and adds two members with expertise in airborne pollutants to water, and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call. The last one passed by about 130."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg. Give the Gentleman order."

Grotberg: "Will the Gentleman yield for ah...point or two?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Williams: "Yes."

Grotberg: "Representative Williams. Ah...is this, it says create the Water Resources Commission. I thought we had one for years."



Williams: "It...ah...creates the Water Resources Commission. This has an automatic repealer on the Water Pollution, Water Resources and it's called now the Water..."

Grotberg: "We have to do it every General Assembly to recreate it?"

Williams: "No...No..."

Grotberg: "Is this...Is this the existing Mitchler Commission?"

Williams: "Right. This is the existing one. It shortens the name. It makes a few changes that were agreed actually by the Commission and this and the Insurance Commission were the only two that it didn't have a clarification as to the appointment and things like that. So this is agreed by..."

Grotberg: "Yeah, but now you've got air in it. You're studying air and water.."

Williams: "Right, what we did is added."

Grotberg: "Are you on the Commission now?"

Williams: "I'm on the Commission, yes."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Representative Macdonald, explain your vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... I'm the vice-chairman of the Water Pollution, Water Resources Commission and I rise to support this Bill. The reason for the change in the name is because the other name is very unwieldy and the whole Commission agrees that this name should be changed. So I support this particular Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 127 'aye', 2 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 824."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 824. McClain. A Bill for an Act to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative McClain on the Floor? Take that out of the record. 858."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 858. Tipsword. A Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."



Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that comes out of the Economic and Fiscal Commission Study of Child Care in the State of Illinois. This would, thos would provide...ah...for liscensing of Child Care Facilities in the State of Illinois and put some teeth into the Act in requiring that the Department make a report as required in Legislation that we had in previous years that had never been complied with in this Act and for the first time give us some control and some mandatory control to the liscensing of Child Care Facilities in the State of Illinois. I move for the adoption of...of Senate Bill 858."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentlemans...Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes', no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 891. Representative Kane. 891."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 891. Kane..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you rise? Give the Gentleman order please."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just a question in as much as you are skipping on here. Is there any criteria for the order that you're taking them in now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Before you came onto the Floor we announced that we're taking those that received no negative votes in Committee."

Hoffman: "Will we go back numerically?"

Speaker Redmond: "We will, we will go back."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 891. Kane. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 891 is very similar to a House Bill that we've already passed out of the House. What it does is allow...ah...the deferment...ah...of repayment by teacher for repayment of scholarship money for teachers who have not been able to obtain



jobs. What is does is allow a deferment rather than an outright... ah...forgiveness that was in the other Bill. I think this is a much better Bill and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Yes. Mr. Speaker. I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question but I guess it's too late."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I wonder if it permits..."

Speaker Redmond: "Somebody is standing up between the Chair and the Speaker."

Flinn: "Beatty. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question while explaining my vote. How is this different than the other Bill that's passed the House?"

Kane: "The...The other Bill that passed the House re...ah...required a forgiveness. This is just a deferral."

Flinn: "Well I...I wonder what's the use of this Bill then. We've already passed a Bill to forgive the people and now we're going to defer the forgiveness? Well what are we going to defer?"

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

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ah...As I understand this Bill...ah...it does in effect forgive a person his debt if he can not either find a job teaching or whether, or if he also can not meet the requirements of the college he's attending. Now...ah...I can't understand why I see 118 votes up there when in effect you are giving a person a student loan to finish his college education and then just because he's so dumb that he can't make the scholastic grades or...he quits or he can't find a job then you forgive him his payment. This doesn't make sense to me. In fact I feel this is a generous part of our educational system to give him the loan in the first place. We have enough forgiveness built into this. When he does get a student loan he's got a certain number of years that he's got to pay this back...ah...depending upon when he gets a job and so on. So, but to just on his whim, why stupidity



to forgive him the debt completely...ah...just kind of mistifies me and it sure as heck is not what I consider the American custom.

So I would ask...ah...to get this thing down where it belongs."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I only ask one thing. That you read this Bill very carefully before you cast that green light. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well Mr. Speaker, we beat a House Bill or defeated a House Bill that probably had a lot more merit than this one and I can't understand why the vote up there is what it is. We defeated a Bill which would...ah..excuse a teacher who completed requirements but could not get a job from repayment of thier scholarship. Now we're voting to excuse a person who flunks out or for one reason or another doesn't complete. Probably because they don't apply themselves in school. I can't for the life of me understand why in the world we would adopt this kind of Legislation so I would agree possibly for one of the few times this session with my cohort from Will County and urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk. Give him order."

Tuerk: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If this is a noncontroversial Bill I'd like to see one. Now this Bill in effect excuses those people who got a scholarship on the basis of teaching and the fact that they don't teach they're excused. I think it's ridiculous. It deserves a resounding 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Well Mr. Speaker, I would have to agree with Representative Leinenweber. When I was in the Attorney Generals Office I had a, the unfortunate duty of prosecuting and trying to collect on some of these scholarships and the way I read the synopsis of this Bill, it says, 'A person who has accepted a scholarship





and has been able to fulfill the requirements.' Well, one of the requirement's is to live in this state. Now you can be a deadbeat, you could be a flunk-out, but you could also be a good student, you could leave the state and find a better job somewhere else. To me, this is a reward that someone who is nothing more than a deadbeat, who wants something on the state for nothing, and anyone who votes for this is absolutely, should reappraise their vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Campbell? 67 votes, you still want to talk?"

Campbell: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I'm not up to talk on this particular Bill, but I happen to be off of the Floor for the last few Roll Calls, and I know for a fact that I haven't been voted. But I know that there are people voting switches on this House Floor and I'm going to ask for a verification or attendance Roll Call pretty soon, if they don't stop it. And I want the Membership to know that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, and I know that we've only got 62 'aye' votes up there. But the...at one time I think there was some 120 votes, and there have been some remarks made here this evening. I know that I'm wondering what Mr. Tuerk might do if Caterpillar all of a sudden lost all of their contracts if they would keep everybody at work. And it isn't very often that I get up and speak regarding and protecting the teachers, but we have to remember that there were a number of people that accepted a scholarship to go to a teacher's institution and become a teacher, and now with the decrease in the number of students in our schools..."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to Order."

Bradley: "They find it impossible, and I reiterate, they find it impossible to re...get a job so that they might fulfill their obligation that they accepted. It isn't that they don't want to fulfill the job, they certainly do. You and I know that jobs are simply not there, so I don't know what we expect



them to do if they can't find a job to fulfill their obligation that they're very willing to do. Now if we want to...ah...if we want to supply the jobs, so that they can go ahead and work, that's one thing, but if the jobs simply are not there, and that's what's happening, and as I say to Mr. Tuerk, I'm not always up protecting the teachers, but I know that this same thing happened with nurses, who go to nursing school, that we pay the full tuition to...for those nurses to go to school to be...to then go to work in our Mental Health Departments, and they can't find a job in the Mental Health Department. I think it's a good Bill, and I know that I object to people getting up and talking when some Bill is defeated, but we were up to 110 at one time. I just suggest that the one's that are voting no, to stop and think about it a little bit, to determine where are those jobs and how do these people complete that obligation. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

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

I have to take...to belabor the point too. But I would like to call your attention to this fact. I happen to serve as counselor for a good many years, and I think part of the bla...part of the blame belongs on our Board of Higher Education, on the Illinois Office of Education, for misadvising these people as well as we counselors. At the time that we recommended that they go into teaching and the scholarships were there, we had no way of knowing, and they had no way of knowing that jobs were not going to be there when they graduated. And it's no fault of theirs. It's bad enough when they graduate and they can't get a job, but to turn around and say that we promised you that you didn't have to make this repayment, but now because the jobs aren't there, you're going to have to pay back this money. I think it's grossly unfair to those students, and I hope that some of you will reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I would simply like to reinforce the remarks of Representative



Brinkmeier and Representative Bradley, and point out that in the Senate Education Committee, this was voted out 11 to 0. It passed the Senate by a vote of 45 to 1. It passed the Higher Education Committee of the House, a 14 to 0, and for the reasons Representative Brinkmeier has mentioned. This could be your son or your daughter, who enter a program in good faith, and then by the time they complete the program, there is no job there. Ah...I would suggest perhaps the Sponsor might want to take this out of the Record until there's a more sober time when people could consider this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There is one other consideration in regard to this Bill that hasn't been mentioned. And that consideration is that this program was created at the time in the State of Illinois when we had a dire need for teachers, and we created this program to induce young people to go into the teaching profession. That's not true today. But let me suggest to you, that the State of Illinois and our society has received its consideration. We have gotten the benefits from this program, and now this Bill does nothing but say in a time when we don't need teachers, when there are no additional jobs available for those who graduated, that we are going to extend the obligation. We're not eliminating it like we did in the last Bill, we're talking about an extension on the obligation. The State and the people of this State have received the considerations that this program was designed for, to get more teachers into the teaching profession, and now it seems to me that the only thing that we can do, under these circumstances of high unemployment, is to relieve at least extend the obligations under this program. This is a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The only thing that I would say is that, you know, where are all the votes that were there a couple of minutes ago? What this Bill does is simply



defer for a year, for a maximum of five years, the obligation for teachers who have received scholarships under a program which we passed several years ago, saying that if they cannot get a teaching job now, and we all know that teaching jobs are very low, they're hard to get, that if they cannot get a teaching job within the first five years of graduating, that they can defer that obligation to repay that money to the state for a period of five years. In order to get that ah...deferral, they're going to have to get permission from the Office of Education. So this is a simple deferral Bill, it reflects the problem that we have in education now...ah... with the lower enrollment, the lower number of a, of a pupils, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 80 'ayes', 58 'no'. The Bill not having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 910."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 910. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections 15, 16, and 17 of Shawnee Town Regional Port District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Hart: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Shawnee Town Port District Authority Act to add two persons to the Board. One would be appointed by the mayor of Old Shawnee Town. The other would be appointed by the Chairman of the County Board of Hardin County and it would have to be a person who was a resident of that portion of Hardin County which lies within the Shawnee Town Port District Authority Act. These two areas have never had representation on the Board and they...it should be done. I would appreciate the support of the House in the passage of Senate Bill 910."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All 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 118 'ayes', 6 'no', and the



Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 943, Representative Campbell, Representative Campbell, Representative Campbell, Representative Campbell, 943. Take it out of the Record. 955."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 955. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 955 is the product of hearings as a result of complaints that came to the attention of the School Problems Commission following the passage of school bus legislation last year. It was found that a large number of church and religious organizations would have problems complying with the...ah...provisions of the regulations that we passed last year, and Senate Bill 955 is the product of those hearings. It provides for a category known as religious organization busses, and these are busses owned by one, owned and operated by one religious organization for the transportation of persons to and from activity of that religious organization. The religious organization may choose to either operate a properly equipped school bus or may follow the more liberal provisions embodied in 955 for religious organizations vehicle. Ah...the religious organization busses would not be painted school bus yellow, would not be equipped, or would not be required to be equipped the same as a school bus. The setforth requirements for the licensing of these operators and also safety requirements for the loading and unloading of passengers. I...ah...this has been drawn with the approval of the religious organizations throughout the state. It was voted out of the committee without a decending vote, and I submit it for your favorable approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, yes he will."

Grotberg: "Representative Berman. I have had tremendous mail on this Bill from like January or February of this year, regarding the



religious buses. The concern of that mail was that they had to conform with the regular school bus code on the pickup and delivery on state highways, and fall into a whole structure that they've never been dealing with before. Is that amended out?"

Berman: "Well, it changes it. They have an option under this Bill. If they want to operate school busses with all of the requirements, they can. But this Bill is designed to allow them to operate the school busses substantially as they have in the past, and imposes certain requirements, however, that they have indicated can be complied with. This is...this Bill is in response with the complaints that you're talking about."

Grotberg: "Okay...ah...it's a compromise Bill to accomplish the goal, but the religious institutions have been dealt with in the affirmative?"

Berman: "Yes, this is the response to their request. They are in approval of this Bill."

Grotberg: "They are now in approval. I guess that's what I wanted to hear you say. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, he already answered the question I had in mind."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Sponsor will yield for a question. Ah...if we don't pass this Bill the religious organizations can go on operating their busses as they have been?"

Berman: "I'm not sure, and the reason I give you that answer is this. A request was made of the Attorney General for an opinion as to whether, as to whether the Bill we passed last year which was all encompassing in its language would require school busses, I mean, church busses to comply. The Attorney General ruled that he in his interpretation did not think that church busses, now that's busses operated primarily for...ah...shall I say Sunday school operations, were under this. But that's an...ah...Attorney General's opinion, not a court opinion, so what we did was try to give them a more definitive answer and that's what this Bill does. It doesn't... if this Bill doesn't pass, I can't honestly say that they're under



the other one. But a court may rule that they are. This Bill meets with their approval and I think it meets certain safety requirements that the Legislature ought to pass also."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Berman, I just want to make this perfectly clear if I may, to use a old cliche. Ah...we're giving the private schools an opportunity this year, at least the Legislature attempting to, to have a vast amount of money for transportation from the state. Presuming this is held valid by the Governor's signature and later by court rulings, does this Bill bring them in line with the same requirements that our school busses have to comply with for public schools?"

Berman: "Not exactly. If they want to operate a school buss, and that means to allow them to stop on the highway to use the semaphore signals, to have the flashing lights, to stop all traffic in both directions. They can do it if they wish, but this Bill sets up a second catagory...ah...of church or church organization bus, which does not have either the requirements that are imposed upon school busses or the powers that are given to school busses as far as their operation. It's a different catagory. It imposes certain safety standards, but it also allows them certain leeways, and I can go through it, it would be lengthy, but in a nutshell, if they don't want to be astringently sanctioned or a...ah...stringently supervised as school busses, they have another alternative under this Bill."

Griesheimer: "Well, what I'm getting to, is what is a church organiza-bus. You mean for bring kids to and from church or are you talking about church schools?"

Berman: "I'll read you the definition. Ah...'it's every motor vehicle owned or operated by or for a religious organization or denomination for the transportation of persons to or from any activity of the religious organization or denomination.' Now that could be a daily operated church school or it could be a Sunday school."



Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker if I may just...ah...speak to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Griesheimer: "Ah...we are in the process now of giving a vast amount of money to our private schools...a vast amount of money to our private schools so that they can be subsidized in their transportation of their...ah...school children through...ah...their private schools, and I'm very much in favor of this concept. But it would seem to me to enact a law which would give them different rules to operate those school busses by is certainly a ridiculous thing, and the whole concept of selling the idea in the Legislature of subsidizing the busses for private schools, is that they're children just like our children and they're taxpayers, etc. Why should we set up a separate standard for religiously owned busses. They're the same children, they're going to school. I...it would seem to me that this is going off in the wrong direction."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skims. Skims. Simms."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Simms: "Representative Berman. Is it not the intent of this Legislation that under the present Attorney General's rules, that a church cannot use school busses to pickup people for religious purposes and transport them to their activity and back again if they're using a school bus under the existing law unless they meet all of these new safety requirements. Isn't that what the present rule is with the Attorney General's interpretation?"

Berman: "Not, not if I understand the question. I may misunderstand. Let me explain what I understand the Attorney General's opinion to be. We passed an all encompassing school bus safety Bill last Session. Church organizations came in and they asked for a determination of whether they, if they pickup people and bring them on Sunday, to Sunday school, are they included, are they covered by that Bill, and the Attorney General said, that if it's for strictly religious school, like on Sunday, that they're not covered by that Bill. However, that was only an Attorney General's opinion. We in response to the complaint of the church groups, over and above the





Attorney General's opinion, we held a...ah...large number of hearings chaired by a subcommittee by Senator Glass. And this Bill is a product of that, that meets with the approval of these church organizations. That they can comply with and live with this very adequately. Provides safety and yet not the stringency of the previous Act."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, speaking to the Bill. I speak in favor of it, because I think this Legislation is necessary to clear up the gray area of the law. Now, I've had several letters and correspondence from my district regarding the problem, and some of the ...ah...questions and responses that Representative Berman gave. If these church groups are to be able to continue to transport people to and from their religious activity, they're going to have to have this exemption, or there's going to continue to be this gray area. It's also causing a serious problem with the insurance carriers of these religious groups in the type of insurance coverage in which they issue to the respective churches. So I think in order to clear up a very serious situation, that the product which this Bill which Representative Berman is sponsoring is a good Bill and deserves the support of the Assembly, and I would urge that we give a 'yes' vote to Senate Bill 955."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah...yes, Mr. Chairman...ah...Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Vote, record vote. Have all voted who wished? Previous question. On this question the Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 128 'ayes', 7 'nay', the previous question, the Motion carries. Representative Berman to close."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'll take that Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question 133 'ayes',



7 'nays', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 978. Representative Tipsword?"

Selcke: "Senate Bill 978. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Begen...Gentlemen. I would ask you all not to look at the synopsis, because the synopsis is no longer Senate Bill 978. The committee met with the Senate Sponsor of Senate Bill 978, and has completely redrafted the Bill. It's still...ah...entails...incorporates into the Bill the intention of the Senate Sponsor of the Bill but it now has made it a much clearer and much cleaner statute and it is now called the Crime of Forceable Detention, instead of Armed Detention, and it provides for that situation in which any person holds another person by force and it does not have to be armed force it can be any kind of force for the purpose of causing some third person to perform such act. This is the kind of situation where a prison rioter holds an armed guard...ah...hold a guard in the prison, and they are not always armed. Sometimes they are and sometimes they are not. It's a situation where a felon who is discovered in the course of an armed robbery or robbery or a burglary of a business establishment is...ah...seizes someone and holds them hostage and forces the police to do something. It does not endanger any businessman to hold some person until they deliver over something he feels they have stolen from his store, because this is to cause a third person to perform some action. This is a very needed addition to our criminal code and covers this situation that has become far too prevalent in our modern times and which has not been adequately covered by our statute. I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 978."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Be glad to."



Kosinski: "Tip, we had a Bill. Can you hear me? We had a Bill that was identical to this that went through the House that we amended to protect the storekeeper who might hold somebody at gun point. Has this been...has this Senate Bill also been amended, because I don't want to be guilty."

Tipsword: "Yes, Representative Kosinski. This is the Bill you're referring to, that was originally Armed Detention."

Kosinski: "It's okay now?"

Tipsword: "That's right. In fact, it was redrafted in your committee, sir, and we no longer have Armed Detention, it is now mere Forceable Detention and it specifies particularly that this covers the situation where they hold...where a first person holds a second person to cause a third person to do something."

Kosinski: "I am pleased to support this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question 151 'ayes', 1 'nay', and this Bill having Received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 985."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 985."

Speaker Redmond: "D. L. Houlihan."

Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Court Reporter's Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this one out of the Record. 1009."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 1009."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Carroll here?"

Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Carroll...1009. Have to take that one out of the Record. 1016. Lechowicz. 1016."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 1016. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz here? Take it out of the Record. 1030."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 1030. A Bill for an Act to add to Section 26.1, to amend Section 9 of the Housing Authority Act. Third Reading of



the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1030 is adequately described in the Digest. It authorizes thee thee, under the Housing Authorities Act. It authorizes any Authority to construct or repair housing and to promote economically mixed housing under the provision of the Federal Housing and Community Development Act of 1974. There was no opposition to this Bill in the Senate or in the House Committee. The idea is that many of the public housing is...ah...not completely full. There are many vacancies. It was felt that this would stimulate the full occupation of these houses, and as a social measure confining people of similar economic means, particularly on the lower strata is not good public policy, and for that reason I ask for your support of 10, of Senate Bill 1030."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question 123 'ayes', 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1031. Representative Hart."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 10."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the Record at the request of the Sponsor. 1157."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 1157. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act provides for a law in relation to sheriffs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Representative Griesheimer? 1157."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah...this Bill introduced by Senator Lathrow in the Senate provides for the...ah...establishment of auxiliary deputy sheriffs in the State of Illinois, specifying the exact duties in which they can engage. It's very limited, provides that they can handle matters in a non-uniform capacity of directing traffic and other matters as directed by the sheriff, but as...but limited by Amendment as introduced in the House. Specifically provides that no Auxiliary Deputy Sheriff may carry a



weapon unless he is in uniform and only after there has been proper training. Ah...by further Amendment of the Committee, it provides that the Auxiliary Deputy Sheriff shall not be given any form of reimbursement or pay. Ah...excuse me, they are not given any form of pay, but they are given reimbursement for the actual cost or the amount of money they lose from their job while performing these duties. This is a very much needed Bill in various Downstate areas of Illinois where we have a shortage of deputy sheriff's and the county cannot afford to bring on ah...full-time deputy sheriffs. I believe that it meets this provision and would urge its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 125 'ayes', 5 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Berman 'aye'. 1160. Representative Hart? Take that out of the Record. 1161. Is Representative Epton here? Take that out of the Record. 1285. Out of the Record? 1297. Representative Keller on the Floor? 1298."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 1298. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to State Finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1298 was basically restructured as State System of Travel Control Supervision. At the present time all the Constitutional offices are authorized by Statute to regulate travel of their employees. The sole exemption is the Governor. Employees falling under the Governor's jurisdic...jurisdiction is subject to the Travel Control Board made up by a appointee by the Governor, the Comptroller, the Auditor General and their designee. Senate Bill 1298 would remove the Auditor General and the Comptroller from the Governor's Travel Board and permit the appointment by the Governor of all members of the Governor's Travel Control Board, and I would urge your support of this Bill. This Bill was endorsed by The Legisla-



tive Audit Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question 152 'ayes', 3 'nay', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1381. 1381."

Selcke: "Ah...Senate Bill 1381. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

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

Ah...Senate Bill 1381 is an Act to allow...ah...towns to incorporate with a population of 200. It...ah...also has a repeal...ah...a Amendment on it that repeals this in two years. This came about that we have a town over on the Mississippi River in Hancock County. It has 230 people. Hancock County does have...does not have zoning. They have not been able to get zoning as far as this town is concerned, and the only way that they can get flood insurance they have to be incorporated without...ah...when the county isn't zoned. And this therefore would allow them to get flood insurance under the...This has a self-repealer order for two years, and...ah...therefore I would appreciate a affirma... affirmative vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster's."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one Bill we need. This is a people's Bill. The people down there on the River need this Bill if they are going to continue to have insurance on their houses. It's something we need very much. I would urge a 'yes' vote on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I just want to say this is identical to House Bill 165 that was passed by both Houses. The Municipal League does not object to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Simms, to explain your vote."



Simms: "Ah...explaining my vote, if I could ask a question of Representative Neff. Is there a Repealer on this?"

Neff: "It's got a Repealer on it in...ah...two years. Duh, duh, duh, long time incorporator any other town, and then it's automatically off in two years."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to vigorously oppose it, but we had a similar problem up in Winnebago with a smaller community, that...ah...went into for creating a small municipality for the sole purpose of a liquor license, and...ah...for this reason I'm going to cast a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the Record. This question 134 'ayes', 8 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1382."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 1382."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sangmeister."

Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Library District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sangmeister. Representative Stubblefield. Representative Von Boeckman, I'm sorry. Representative Von Boeckman here? 1382. Ha-he. Representative Von Boeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I didn't know this was take off...was taken off of the Consent Calendar. But...ah...anyway what this Bill does is require the libraries to give notice to the areas of annexation and the judge who orders the election to notify the County Clerk of the same, and that the expense...ah...of the election and the notification would be borne by the library. I ask your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he will."

Deuster: "I've been getting all kinds of mail from the libraries in my district...ah...urging me to violently oppose this and they said it would be exorbitantly expensive. I would like to ask you this, two questions. One is what kind of notice is required? Must a letter be sent to every registered voter or just precisely what is the notice?"



VonBoeckman: "Well, the notice is...ah...according to the Bill and the Amendment was placed in the Senate. A notice is to be sent to all the registered voters in the area to be incorporated into the library district. It's...ah...it doesn't mean the whole district, it just says the area that's to be incorporated."

Deuster: "Well,...ah...you're not talking about publication, you're actually talking about mailing a letter to every person. Is that correct?"

VonBoeckman: "A notice plus publication in the news media too."

Deuster: "Well publication and also notice."

VonBoeckman: "Right."

Deuster: "So they would be required to address envelopes and to whom would they be, to the registered voters or to the property owners?"

VonBoeckman: "To the registered voters in the area to be annexed."

Deuster: "Do you have any cost estimate as to what this would...ah... cost?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, it all depends on the area to be annexed. What the...the reason the Bill come about...ah...that Senator Sommer's put this Bill in. We had a Fon Dulac Library System who did...ah... everything...ah...unethical to get people into a district without notification, so this...ah...is the result to safeguard so that the people that are to be annexed are notified properly."

Deuster: "Now the last question that I would have is...ah...I don't know of any other incidence in the Illinois Statutes where such a requirement is imposed. I don't think with a school referendum ah...that we have to send a letter to every registered voter in the school district, do we?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, not necessarily...ah...Representative Deuster, but ...ah...this is an election that we would say that hardly anybody pays attention to, and if it's a small area to be annexed, I'm sure the cost will be minimal, and I think the original Bill called for notification is the reason the libraries got up in arms of notifying everyone in the library district of the election, and it was amended to just conform with area annexed. It's a good piece of legislation. It prevents the library from doing, you know, what





they're supposed to."

Deuster: "The last question. Is my understanding correct, that the Library Associations oppose this Bill?"

VonBoeckman: "Not really. I haven't had any formal notification to that effect."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. There's some question asked earlier that I would like to respond to, to clarify again. This was before the House Elections Committee. The House Amendment that on, that was offered by me, and basically what we are doing is saying that when a taxing district, in this case, a library taxing district intends to have an election to add more territory, which means imposing a property tax on citizens within a particular area, that they ought to notify the people who would have this tax imposed upon them. I don't think this is burdensome because what they're going after is a greater or a more substantial tax base, so they would be getting more money in if this refe...if this election is successful. Ah...the Amendment that we added in the House is just a technical Amendment which says where you're going to have an election and the County Clerk has to run it, well by God somebody ought to notify the County Clerk that the election is going to be held. I think this is a good idea, and whether or not it exists for other taxing districts, I, I think it's irrelevant. I think it's a good idea and probably ought to be expanded to other types of special taxing districts, and I rise in support of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Sponsor will yield for a question? Representative VonBoeckman, did I understand you to say that the FonDulac Library Board used unethical means in your area to get some money into the library district?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, I, I...maybe I did say that but...ah...the proper notice wasn't put in the proper paper...ah...from my understanding. The people that were annexed were unaware of what was happening except the individuals that were close to a library system, so the



complaint was, how come every property owner wasn't notified, every voter in the...ah...district to be annexed to be notified, so the end results, you have people coming to the General Assembly saying we want to protection, and I think it's up to, we, Members of the General Assembly to see that these people are protected in a...in a voting rights and in their taxing rights."

Dunn: "Representative VonBoeckman the Secretary of State is the real head of the State Library. I wonder if the Director of the Library Association knows about this or the Secretary of State, his office. And did they approve it, or did they appear in Committee, do you know?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, there was no opposition anywhere along the line on this and...ah...it was on the Consent Calendar...ah...so the Committee saw fit that it was a good Bill, and I personally think it's a good Bill. It passed through the Senate without opposition."

Dunn: "Thank you. The Illinois Library Association is quite a lively organization, and I'm sure they would have known about the Bill. Did they not oppose it or?"

VonBoeckman: "They didn't oppose it in any committee hearing whatsoever."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, if I may speak just a minute on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Dunn: "I chaired a library...ah...Revenue Subcommittee last year that held hearings throughout the state to talk about the libraries and the plight of libraries. I think one thing that came to the library, to the Revenue Committee was the plight of the libraries as regard to finances. I think this would be an undue expense on libraries. I don't mind, and I think that everyone should be notified if they are going to be taken into a library district or any other district that is going to cause a tax, but by the same token I think libraries have enough trouble, have enough financial trouble and difficulties without going to an added expense. I think the County Clerk is duly authorized and should notify people when it's going to be an election held and I think that's alright to do, but not to burden the libraries. I urge the defeat of this Bill. Thank



you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Vote 'aye'. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm not so much concerned about a notice going out, but what I am concerned about is that this Bill provides that the notice goes to the wrong person. Is this previous question? Oh, I'm sorry, I'll hold off."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 90 'ayes', 8 'no', and the Motion carries. Representative VonBoeckman to close."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...I don't know what else I can add to it, but I feel like this is good protection for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, especially when districts are to be incorporated, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't see the Gentleman back there. Oh, it's Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to speak very very vigorously, as much as I can, against this Bill. I think it's very very unfair to ask the library district to do something we don't like, or that we don't demand of any other."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we're a little early here. We have Representative VonBoeckman to close."

Lucco: "I'm Sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. VonBoeckman, do you want to close? The question is..."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker,...ah...I think everybody had their opportunity to talk and...ah...I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Lucco. Would the Master of Arms break up the caucus in the aisle on the Republican side."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to solicit a no vote



because I think we're asking the library district to do something that we do not ask or demand of any other taxing or voting or electing body. I think it's very very unfair to expect them to notify each and every voter in their district by mail, and I have received many many letters in opposition from library boards and library districts throughout the Southern part of the state, and I think that we're asking here something very very unreasonable, and I certainly would urge a no vote on this Bill.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 45 'ayes', 57 'no', the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 1468."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 1468. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 3 of an Act to provide for the financing of State Program for Research, Development, and Demonstration in Coal and Energy, henceforth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1468 is exactly the same as a House Bill that was passed with one hundred thirty some votes. It is exactly the same as listed in your Digest under Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2. Ah...when the Coal Development Bond Act was passed, we later found that we gave too broad powers to imminent domain and this Bill is a ...a compromise that has been worked out between the Board of Economic Development, the Energy Resources Commission and the Illinois Environmental Council. I move for the favorable passage and ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All 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 131 'ayes', 7 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 314. I don't know why they're out of sequence, but they are. Representative Collins. Where would I find it here? 1478."



Selcke: "Senate Bill 1478. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1478 amends the Illinois Municipal Retirement Article of the Pension Code in that it changes the reduction in widow's benefits on account of age differential between the spouses from five to fifteen years. Ah...this Bill has been thoroughly discussed with the...ah...Pensions Law Commission, and has no opposition, and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question 128 'aye', 1 'nay', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Selcke: "Maragos 'aye'. Gottcha Sam."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll go back and take those where the Sponsors were not present. Senate Bill 700. Representative Farley. Is he here? Take that one out of the Roll Call. 701. Representative McClain. Is he here?"

Selcke: "Senate Bill 701. Not here Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain here? Take it out of the Record. Ah...Giglio, 739. Representative Pierce here? Here comes Representative Pierce."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 739. A Bill for an Act authorizing delegation of health ....to physican's assistants under supervisonal licensed physician. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Uh...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 739 creates the Physician's Assistant Act. It passed the Senate Committee without a negative vote and the Senate without a negative vote, and the House Human Resources Committee without a negative vote. We've amended the Bill so that it's now acceptable to the Medical Society, to the Illinois Department of Public Health, to the Illinois Department of Registration and Education, which must administer the Bill. We put an Amendment on for the



optometrist, make them happy, and we delayed the effective date of the Bill to July 1, 1976 to give the Department time to gear-up for the phys...Physician's Assistant Act. This is a project that Senator Berning has been working on, at least, four or five years, and I think we're now at the point where the Bill has the approval of almost all affected groups, and can be passed into law to let these paramedics, many of whom served in the Armed Forces...ah...now be licensed in our State and get some recognition. Each doctor will be limited to one, to one physician's assistant only. St. Louis University has already geared-up and Washington D. C. to educate the physician's assistants, and I ask that the Bill, at this time, be favorably considered."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Peters."

Peters: "If I may, Mr. Speaker, just one question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Peters: "Representative Pierce, are there any House Amendment's on this?"

Pierce: "There's three House Amendments. Committee Amendment #1 took care of a little problem with the optometrist. Committee Amendment #...ah, no...Floor Amendment #2, which I sponsored at the request of the Department of Public Health...ah...made certain that the Bill would apply to doctors in Public practice, in public clinics, as well as the doctors in private practice, and Amendment #3 delayed the effective date to July 1, of 1976."

Peters: "Thank you very much Representative Pierce, thank you. Good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Berman."

Berman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Berman: "Is there anything in this Bill regarding liability or waiver of liability?"



Pierce: "No, we don't deal with that problem in this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Sevcik 'aye'. On this question there's 152 'aye' 2 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Daniels. Tipsword 'aye'."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I'd like to return House Bill 720 to the Order of Second Reading and leave it there for a while. I'm sorry. Senate Bill 720."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave? Any objections? Leave granted. 720 on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, could you tell me if my light is working up there? I...ah...had it on for quite a while."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on now."

Madison: "Alright. I just wanted to know sir."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess maybe I had the literature on top of it. I'm sorry."

Madison: "Okay. ha,ha."

Speaker Redmond: "This wasn't designed to hold papers and also see lights. 700."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 700. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Occupation Disease Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley. Representative Berman, please."

Farley: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would ask that we hear House Bill,er...Senate Bill 700 and Senate Bill 971 together."

Speaker Redmond: "They the same subject matter?"

Farley: "Yes sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections. Leave granted."

Selcke: "Senate Bill 971. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Farley."

Farley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 700 would amend the Workmen's Occupational Disease Act to extend coverage to public officials. Senate Bill 971 would also



amend the Workmen's Compensation Act to extend coverage to public official. I...ah...had the same House Bills before this Chamber...ah...in May and what these Bills would do, would eliminate the exclusion of public officials thereby extending coverage to both...ah...ah...under Workmen's Compensation and Workmen's Occupational Disease Act to any person in the service of a state or local govern... government where they're elected or appointed. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

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

I rise to oppose this Bill for no other reason that it would be applicable for no other reason than the fact that it would be applicable to both full-time and part-time election officials. Part-time regardless of the amount of time they do spend in their elected positions, and when they're probably covered by Workmen's Compensation and the Workmen's Occupational Disease Act in another position. And I think the problem on the Bill is compounded by two Bills that we previously passed greatly extend the matter of where and when the disease or the injury was incurred, making it far more difficult to prove that there isn't a liability upon the employer, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I intend, too, to oppose these Bills because of the expense that they will cause to the local governments that...ah..are so ill equipped now to handle additional expense. In addition to what the Gentleman that just spoke said, with respect to the difficultness in identifying what is a work incurred disease or a disability that has resulted from...ah...their employment, this is entirely a new concept, and an additional expense that the taxpayers will have to bear, and I would think that we would wait for better times, before we got into a program as extensive as this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."





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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Beatty: "Bruce, there's quite distinction in the Bills, and I wonder what the difference is? Senate Bill 700, you've got the exception of members of the fire department, and in Senate Bill 971 which is the Workmen's Compensation Act, you take out the police men and the firemen. How come you don't take out the policemen in Senate Bill 700?"

Farley: "Well, the exclusion...ah...of the policemen and firemen in, in 700 is in that they have their own...ah...disability and Workmen's Occupational Disease Program, and we excluded them so that we could just include the...ah...publicly elected officials."

Beatty: "No, but in the one Bill, you've got policemen and firemen out, in 79...ah...971, and you got both police and firemen out but in the other one you've only got firemen. In other words, the way you got these Bills, there would be some policemen covered by Occupational Disease which is a big departure from the law as it presently is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question, too, of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Why, do you exclude the police and fire department members of only the City of Chicago?"

Farley: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question."

Leinenweber: "Why are the police and firemen only in the City of Chicago excluded from both Bills?"

Farley: "I don't...ah...their pension programs are separate from the Downstate pension programs. These are two separate pension programs and they are...ah...separate in that they...ah...the City of Chicago is...ah...separate from the Downstate program."

Leinenweber: "Well, we're not really talking about pension, we're talking about Workmen's Compensation, and as I understand these Bills, both of them exclude the members of the Workmen's Compensation one excludes members of the police and fire department of the City of Chicago, and leave the police and firemen of all



other communities in the state. Why is that?"

Farley: "Well, the Bills are so drafted so that..."

Leinenweber: "Well, it's by Amendment. Originally they were in, and then by Senate Amendment #1...ah...the police and firemen were taken out."

Farley: "Well, I would like Mr. Shea to...ah...answer that question. He's a lot more familiar with the particular question than I am."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Under the pension plan as enacted by this General Assembly, the fire and police of the City of Chicago are covered under time off where they're covered for full-time and then three-quarters time for any reason they're off, and...ah...for any duty disability they're covered substantially better than under any Workmen's Comp Act."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 109 'ayes', 16 'no', the Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Representative Geo-Karis is 'aye'. Taylor will you step up here, I'm being abused. 649. Representative Keller on the Floor? Take it out of the Record. 662."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 662. Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 662 was introduced at the request of the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund. Ah...a trust fund, and it provides that the surviving spouse annuity shall be a percentage, usually fifty percent of the annuity awarded the retired employee at the date of retirement and it also makes certain, removes certain provisions made obsolete by Amendments to the Income Tax Act and other obsolete provisions. It also includes a provision passed by the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly, but inadvertently omitted from the engrossed Bill. Ah..."



that's all it does, and it came out of committee, I understand unanimously, and I solicit a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. This question there's 130 'aye', 8 'no', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 813."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 813. Richmond. A Bill for an Act making appropriation for the recodification of the laws relating to municipalities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 813 appropriates \$75,000 to the Municipal Problems Commission for recodification of the Municipal Code. This Bill passed through the Senate 49 to 1, and passed with a big majority in the appropriation's ones. They...the last time this Bill was this was done was in '59. The Municipal Problems Commission will be charged with the task of a...recodifying this Section of our Statutes, and those of you who deal in that section know that this...ah...this job is badly needed. I urge a 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "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 Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really wonder whether we ought to pass this or not. The Gentleman as he actually points out, this was done in 1959, and...ah...this is relatively new compared to many of the sections of the Statute. I...I've done a lot of municipal law work, certainly I could suggest improvements, but I wonder whether we need to spend \$75,000.00 of the taxpayers money when there's a shortage of money to do something that was done really about fifteen years ago and is relatively up to date. I think it's a waste of money and we're looking for places to cut, this is a good place to start. I urge a 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 93 'ayes', 38 'no', the Bill



having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 706. Representative Porter. 706. Out of the Record. Take it out of the Records at the request of the Sponsor. 750. Representative McDonald."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 750. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative MacDonald."

MacDonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 750 is a technical Amendment that allows school boards to transfer their proceeds from bonds issued for vocational education to the Capital Development Board instead of to the School Building Commission, which is now nonexistent. There was an Amendment in the Senate which also prohibits the use of school district funds earmarked for travel conventions and meetings by anyone other than the school board member. There apparently have been instances in which school board members use district funds to provide for families, for vacations, which attending public educational meetings. This is not only improper use of funds, but it uses money badly needed for financially strapped school districts for reasons of totally unconnected for the improvement of local education and I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed, 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 140 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. 814. Representative Calvo. Is Calvo on the Floor? 829. D. L. Houlihan."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 829. A Bill for an Act to authorize creation of mutual trust investment companies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to have considered as a package, Senate Bills 829, 830, 831 and 832."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Leave."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 830. A Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."



Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 831. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning powers of corporations authorized to accept and execute trusts. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 832. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Security Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these Bills would permit, subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Banks and Trusts, the creation of mutual trusts in investment companies to provide common trust funds in which Illinois banks and trust companies may invest assets of their fiduciary accounts. The principal Bill is Senate Bill 829, which authorizes the creation of mutual trust investment companies. By way of background, Illinois enacted the Common Trust Fund Act in 1940. The two factors are fairly well limited its use of the large trust departments in this State. Those two limiting factors are, first, it's a Federal investment company act of 1940, which regulates all collective or mutual funds, exempts common trust funds only if they are used for the investment of the creating bank's own fiduciary account, and secondly, the administrative costs for investment staff and custodial service effectively restrict the use of common trust funds from an economic standpoint to those trust departments whose large value of trust assets enable them to properly diversify the investments and to absorb the cost of a well qualified investment staff. The purpose of this legislation is to make available for the smaller, more moderate size trust departments a common trust fund form of investment vehicle. Because of the restriction in the Federal Investment Company Act of 1940, the fund here is organized as a mutual investment company, which is subject to SEC registration and Federal supervision. Additionally, the mutual trust investment company is subject to an examination by the Commissioner of Banks and the Commissioner is given broad rule-making power. A mutual trust investment company can be organized by five or more officers or directors of a bank or banks. There is no other limitation except that the incorporators must apply to the Commissioner of Banks for a permit. The Commissioner is to issue



the permit if he finds that there is reasonable promise of a successful operation. Senate Bill 829 adopts almost verbatim the wording of the existing Common Trust Fund Act, which has had a good experience in this State over the past thirty-five years. Now, the operation is that this is an open end mutual company whose funds must be invested under the Prudin Man Rule and whose shares can only be purchased by corporate trust companies for their own fiduciary accounts. It is restricted and will operate the same as a Common Trust Fund. It shares a redeemable unit of ownership in the common fund. They are nonassignable. None can be sold to the public or to a bank for its own investment. It's limited to a corporate trustee acting in a fiduciary capacity. I emphasize that this legislation is permissible. No bank is mandated to invest in such a fund. It simply makes a common fund available as an investment vehicle. If a bank, acting as a fiduciary desires to use, the Commissioner of Banks has reviewed this proposed legislation and has stated in writing that he has no objections to the Bill. So has the Secretary of State. As far as the companion measure, Senate Bill 830, amends the Business Corporation Act. Permits a mutual trust investment company to be organized as an Illinois corporation. Senate Bill 831 would allow mutual trust investment companies the same authorization now given to all corporate fiduciaries in Illinois to file securities by issue and to deposit securities with a clearing corporation. The last measure, Senate Bill 832 exempts these mutual trust and investment companies from the Illinois Blue Sky Law, because these will be regulated by the SEC and by the Commissioner of Banks. This is the package of Bills and I would urge your support. I believe it only had one dissenting vote in the Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Lechowicz: "Would these be Illinois corporations?"

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

Lechowicz: "Would these be ah..... Illinois corporations?"

Houlihan: "That is correct."



Lechowicz: "And they would be governed by whom?"

Houlihan: "By the Commissioner of Banks."

Lechowicz: "And under.... what's the limit of the mutual trust investment company act? What could they invest in? Could they be holding companies for the bank?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sangmeister."

Houlihan: "Would you wait just a minute?"

Lechowicz: "Surely."

Houlihan: "This does not create, Representative Lechowicz, any new powers as far as the investing authority, as far as the trust funds, you know of the fudiciary. The purpose of the legislation is to obtain the expertise and the diversity of being able to pool the assets of the membership of the trust fund. But it doesn't create any new powers as far as corporate fudiciary power to invest trust assets."

Lechowicz: "Could they buy the assets within their own bank? Could they buy their own bank's stock?"

Houlihan: "They can invest their own trust funds. Ah..... I'm not in a position, frankly, to answer your question, can they buy their own bank's stock. Only if their own bank's stock was an asset of their own trust fund."

Lechowicz: "What's the purpose of the intial trust investment company trust act?"

Houlihan: "The purpose is, I've explained, is to allow, because of the pooling of the assets, to allow, particularly for smaller trust departments, to have the expertise that they would not have, simply limited to their own trust funds, because with the pooling of assets to diversify and also to have the expertise that they would be able to have because of the large amount of trust assets that they would be dealing with. If you have a problem with the Bill, Ted, I'll pull it out. I realize this is a very technical Bill. If you have questions with it, I'd be happy to sit down with you."

Lechowicz: "Well, I just want to make sure that this isn't another way around branch banking."

Houlihan: "Well, let me emphasize that that is absolutely not what this is intended to be."



Lechowicz: "Well, I just want to also make sure that it isn't like some other large banks in the City of Chicago, who in turn, own about 14 or 15 very small banks and is pooling the assets to just make it legal."

Houlihan: "Well, let me emphasize, we're not attempting to do something untoward here. This has been submitted to the Commissioner of Banks of the State of Illinois, who has approved the legislation. If you have questions of a technical nature, this is a technical Bill, I'd be happy to take it out and sit down and explain it with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a similar question. I know what the thrust of this Bill does. What concerns me, Dan, and I think maybe you can.... if you're going to pull it out, we could relate to it and maybe put an Amendment on. What concerns me very much is the fact that there's no limitation as to which banks would become a major stockholders in this Mutual Trust Company, and thereby maybe controlling the investments, where the smaller banks, although maybe it intended to help the smaller banks and the trust departments of smaller banks, they may be drowned out by the power and economics of the bigger banks."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, because there may be some problems along with.... in line with what Mr. Maragos is saying, take these out of the Record, if you will, at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Take them out of the Record. The Order of business is concurrence. We've got a new Speaker. Representative Washburn, take over the....."

Washburn: "O'kay, you're going to have to instruct me. On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 674. Representative Tipsword. Did I say Senate Bill, or Senate Bill 1250. House Bill 1250. On the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 674. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill that we discussed the other evening, and Representative Ebbesen had some questions about it. This is the Bill with regard to the downstate firemen and policemen. It provides that the municipalities can make no changes that are in the Fireman and Policeman Pension Law that are not in conformity with the Statutes of the State of Illinois. I would move for





concurrence."

Washburn: "The Gentleman has moved to concur. Is there any discussion?  
Representative Shea."

Shea: "Is this the one where the Senate put in the exclusion that we  
took out in the House?"

Tipsword: "The Senate put it back in and it's in the way that it came  
to the House, Jerry. And it affects only downstate cities."

Shea: "Why do you say that?"

Tipsword: "Well, it doesn't affect the home-rule unit in the City of  
Chicago."

Shea: "Well, I'm not worried about the home-rule units in the City. What  
is the language that the Senate put back in?"

Tipsword: "The Senate put back in that it affects home-rule units. The  
language that was in before."

Shea: "I hate to ask you this, but can you take it out and we'll talk  
about this? Or do you want to go with it?"

Tipsword: "It's been out twice."

Shea: "Well, I know, and it keeps coming back in before we talk."

Tipsword: "I think we ought to get it concluded. Don't you? If you've  
got something that you..... What are we going to talk about?"

Washburn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah..... this  
Bill came out of the Pension Committee and this Amendment was  
adopted. Now, I personally, I would move that we nonconcur with  
this particular Amendment. The Pension Funds are presently guaran-  
teed under the Constitution, and ah..... I personally feel that  
there's no need for this particular Amendment to be adopted; that  
if there's any deficiencies in these funds that they can go to the  
Attorney General and ah..... bring suit against these funds, but  
I don't think the Legislature should compel these municipalities  
ah.... and forcing them into the operation of their particular  
fund, so I would urge a 'no' vote on the concurrence."

Washburn: "Any further discussion? Representative Tipsword to close."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, rather than waste the time of the House right  
now, I would ask to take this out of the Record. I'll talk to  
Representative Shea about it."



Washburn: "Take it out of the Record. House Bill 773. Representative Molloy."

Molloy: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #2 merely removes some superfluous language and Senate Amendment #3 sets forth the rate of one-fourth percent below the existing usuary rate for credit unions who are making first mortgage loans on real estate. I would ask that the House adopt.... concur in Senate Amendment #2 and #3."

Washburn: "Is there any discussion? If..... Representative Downs."

Downs: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Washburn: "He indicates he will."

Downs: "Yes, Representative, what is the change from the Bill in its present form?"

Molloy: "The ah.... in Amendment #2....."

Downs: "On Amendment #3."

Molloy: "On #3, it ah.... has credit unions, subject to the existing usuary rate, it rates one-fourth below the existing usuary rate for other financial institutions. I talked to the industry and they're agreeable to it, and ah.... there's no problem with us on the Amendment."

Molloy: "You have a 9-1/2 percent usuary rate at the present time. This would be 1/4th percent under that amount. So it would be 9-1/4th effective for credit unions."

Downs: "If the usuary rate was 8 percent and after the year and a half situation here, could go down to 8 percent for credit unions, it would be 7.... it would be 1/4th under them. Seven and three quarters."

Washburn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Yeow, would the Sponsor yield?"

Washburn: "This is the national 9-1/2.... 9....."

Molloy: "9-1/4th would be the maximum."

Schlickman: "Does this Bill, as amended by the Senate, provide for the first time that credit unions can engage in mortgage lending?"

Molloy: "No, presently they can engage. It just increases the amount that they can ah.... lend subject to some regulations of the Department of Financial Institutions. One, the loans are subject



to ah.... the person receiving ah.... a real estate loan, would have to have 20 percent down. The maximum amount of time is 15 years. These are on guidelines set forth by the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions. That's in addition to what the Act reads."

Schlickman: "Would you mind repeating what the maximum interest rate will be?"

Molloy: "The maximum interest rate at the present time would be 9-1/4th percent."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Washburn: "Any further discussion? Representative Molloy, to close."

Molloy: "I would ask ..... it would be 1/4 whatever the interest..... I would ask that the House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and #3."

Washburn: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 773. This if final action. It takes 89 votes. All those in favor of the Motion, signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed, vote 'nay'. Clerk will take the Record. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 132 'ayes', 2 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. The Motion is carried, and the House does concur. On the Order of Concurrences House Bill 871. Representative Pouncey."

Pouncey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the House do not concur to Senate Amendment #1 on 8.... on House Bill 871. Nonconcur."

Washburn: "The Motion is to nonconcur. Is there discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Could we have an explanation of the Senate Amendment?"

Washburn: "I'm sure Representative Pouncey would explain the Amendment."

Pouncey: "The Senate Amendment.... the Bill describes as the.... the laboratory should be inspected, but the Senate Amendment says the Department may require a demonstration, and the word should be 'shall have a demonstration of a proficiency'."

Washburn: "Any further discussion? If not, Representative Pouncey, to close."

Pouncey: "Well, I wish to move to do not concur, Sir."



Washburn: "The Gentleman moves that the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 871. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion, signify by saying 'aye'. All opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does not concur. On the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 883. Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 883."

Washburn: "Any discussion? Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "What does it do?"

Capparelli: "Mr. Fleck, I read it over six times and it doesn't do anything else than what I sent over there originally. They rewrote it and it says the same thing. I'll read it to you and I can't figure it out."

Fleck: "Wait.... wait.... If you can't figure it out and you're the Sponsor, maybe....."

Capparelli: "I say it doesn't change my Bill one bit and I'm happy with it, and I'll read it to you and see if you can see any difference. In my Bill it says 'in counties of one million or more, inhabitants, a homestead improvement exemption limited to a maximum of \$15,000 in actual value when the property is owned and used exclusively for residential purposes upon demonstration that an increase in assessed valuation was attributable to the new improvement in an existing structure'. Now the Senate Amendment says 'In counties of one million or more, inhabitants, a homestead improvement exemption pursuant to article'. They put Article IX, Section 6, of the 1970 Constitution. 'Limited to an annual maximum of \$15,000 in actual value of the property and used exclusively for residential purposes upon demonstration that a proposed increase of assessed value is attributable solely to the new improvement of existing structure'. So, I mean, they rearranged the words. It says the same thing, so I'll concur."

Fleck: "O'kay."

Washburn: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Would the Sponsor answer a question, please?"

Washburn: "He indicates he will."



Duff: "Well, Representative Capparelli, ah.... doesn't it sound like the Senate Amendment makes a big difference, when it makes it apply to counties over a million or more only?"

Capparelli: "Mine did the same thing."

Duff: "Why should it apply to counties of million or more...."

Capparelli: "We have a second Bill that handles the rest of the State. Mr. Hanahan has that."

Duff: "Thank you."

Washburn: "Any further discussion? Representative Dunn, the Gentleman from Macon."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question? I'm not sure I understand this.... the Act or the Amendment which you're considering concurrence. Does this Bill relate to ah..... a real property tax exemption, or does it relate to the ah.... home-stead section of the exemption act?"

Capparelli: "It.... the 15,000 is the actual value of the improvement and in Chicago, that would be 22 percent of the 15,000."

Dunn: "So you're saying this, in effect, reduces the homeowners real property tax Bill. Is that...."

Capparelli: "Only on the improvement."

Dunn: "Right. O'kay, I understand what you're talking about. Thank you."

Washburn: "Any further discussion? Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "I would move to concur."

Washburn: "The Gentleman has moved to Concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 883. Final action. It requires 89 votes for passage. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion to concur, signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed, vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 143 'ayes', 4 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 883. On the Order of concurrences, House Bill 886. Representative LaFluer."

LaFluer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 886. The Amendment merely makes the Act take effect immediately upon becoming law."



Washburn: "Is there any discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 886. Final Action requires 89 votes. Those in favor of the Motion, signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 128 'ayes', 7 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 886. On the Order of Concurrences, House Bill 919. Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, all this Amendment does Senate Amendment #1 to House 919, it takes the underscored language from one paragraph and moves it up into the paragraph up above on page 6, and states that beginning with the effective date of January 1, 1976. That's all the Amendment does. It's a clarifying Amendment and I would move for the adoption of..... or concurrence of ah..... Amendment #1 to House Bill 919."

Washburn: "Representative Hudson, the Gentleman from DuPage."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield? Just one question here. What is the ah..... let see, what is the.... would you explain the Asian Development Bank? What is it?"

McPartlin: "Where is that at?"

Hudson: "Representative, I offer my apologies, I'm on the wrong Bill."

Washburn: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

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

McPartlin: "Yes."

Catania: "Ah.... looking at the Digest, ah..... description of Senate Amendment #1, I see that it talks about 1-1/2 percent of salary of each male present employee. What does it do about the female present employee?"

McPartlin: "The way.... actually ah..... what the paragraph that we're actually talking about, the contribution for the widows' annuity for present employees and future entrance, beginning on the effective date and so on, so actually we are talking about the widows annuity."

Catania: "Well, there are presently some female employees, are there not, and I would assume that there might be future entrants who are female employees and there might be widowers annuities and what does



it do about that?"

McPartlin: "Well under the general code...ah...I imagine that the female would pay in for her...for her spouse."

Catania: "Well you say you imagine it would, but why does it say... specifically male employees."

McPartlin: "It does...it does."

Catania: "So the Digest account is wrong?"

McPartlin: "Well no, the Digest isn't wrong. I mean actually...ah... it...it does cover the...ah...the spouse of a female. It's in there under the code at the present time."

Catania: "And...Do they have the same degree of coverage."

McPartlin: "Positively."

Catania: "Thank you."

McPartlin; "Mr. Speaker, I move for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 919."

Washburn: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate...Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 919? Final action requiring 89 votes for passage. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Has everyone voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', no 'nays', 3 voting question...3 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 919. On the order of concurren...concurrences are House Bill 952. Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 952. It's a clarifying Amendment it makes clear exactly what the Commission will study. I move to concur."

Washburn: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Washburn: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Does the Senate Amendment...You said it clarifies what they will study...ah...Clarify that further by telling me what they will study."

Leon: "No I didn't say that. I said to clarify what studies are advisable. It says laws to determine what statutory changes are needed or advisable if...if any. Those four words were added to the



Bill and inserted in between on the line."

Matijevich: "All right, I'm for it now John."

Washburn: "Any further discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 952 creates another Commission and it would seem to me that at this time of austerity that we should not approve another Commission. An ample number of Members of the House previously have indicated that the approach to take is to reduce the number of Commissions and to concentrate on our standard Committee organization here in the House. By the passage...by the concurrence with this Amendment we will be sending to the Governor another Commission Bill and compounding an already bad situation and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Washburn: "Any further discussion? Representative Leon."

Leon: "I move to concur on the Senate Amendment."

Washburn: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amend... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 952? Final Action, requiring 89 votes for passage. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 102 'ayes', 17 'nay' 4 voting 'present' The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 952."

Speaker Redmond: "Announcements? Representative Barnes? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker...ah...With Leave, I'd like to ask that Senate Bill 1499 be brought back before we actually go into announcements."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Any objections? 1499. Return to the order of Second Reading. Purpose of Amendment."

Lechowicz: "No, it's for a purpose of Amendment Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought that's what I said."

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "1499."

Lechowicz: "It's a Senate Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill...Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well can't this just wait till tomorrow Mr. Speaker. I thought





we were winding down. You were...ah...asking for announcements..."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess not. I will..."

Lechowicz: "Representative Walsh, it's really an emergency matter unfortunately. Senate Bill 1499 is a supplemental appropriation of 14 million dollars to the Department of Revenue for payment of Income Tax Refunds and what the Amendment would do, would."

Walsh: "All right.. Yeah, I've been talked to."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave to return 1499 to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing no objections leave granted. It is on Second Reading. Representative Duff, don't you want the refunds to go out?"

Duff: "Well sure I do Mr. Speaker, but the Amendment's not on our desk."

Lechowicz: "Well it's not."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk has advised it is."

Jack O'Brien: "2:00 p.m."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, I have the up to date booklet our pages keep and the Amendment is not in the book."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck has the Amendment evidently the pages overlooked you Representative Duff. You see them in the morning."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I retr..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. what Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 19... 1499 would do would add two hundred thousand dollars to the State Board of Education for the payment of the normal cost personal services for the past two weeks. There's a question as far as in the operation for fiscal 75, this is merely a supplemental, it's been discussed with the minority leader and the assistant minority leader and on this side there is no objection to adding this additional two hundred thousand dollars to Senate Bill 1499 for the State Board of Education and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1499. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further



Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Third Reading appears House Bill 3062.  
Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to bring this Bill  
back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment by Representative  
Huff?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you. This  
Amendment..... Shall I proceed, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. We'll get there. Proceed."

Huff: "This Amendment ah.... prohibits ah... discrimination in large  
cities, whereby insurance companies charge prohibit rates to  
minority groups and much lower rates to the more affluent class.  
Because the Committee Bill required all citizens in Illinois to  
purchase automobile insurance, including no-fault coverage, thus  
discrimination would be grossly unfair to minority groups. Ah.....  
and also to lower income groups in the Chicago area. The ah.....  
the amendment provides that there should be no variance in the rates  
charged on any given insurance described in this article based upon  
geographic divisions within municipalities with the population of  
500,000 or more. I move for your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, this is an Amendment that had been discussed at  
tremendous length in other sessions when talking about insurance.  
I believe this is open rating, and we were not on the Order of  
House Bills, Third Reading. We were on the Order of Announcements  
and there was a genuine emergency that ah.... Representative Lechowicz  
was permitted to take a Bill back. I don't see what on earth is  
the emergency about this and I think that it could lead to a con-  
siderable amount of debate. I don't think this is the time to con-  
sider a controversial matter like this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ah.... first of all, let me refresh the  
Assistant Minority Leader's memory. This Bill was called earlier  
today. Representative Huff was not on the Floor. I indicated that



I was told second hand that ah..... he did not wish to proceed with Amendment 13, but I indicated that if he did that I would bring this Bill back. Now ah..... and I think the Clerk at that time, the Speaker indicated that the Amendment would be Table, so ah..... by the way, this is not open rating. The Bill merely prohibits the discrimination within the cities of 500,000 as to ah.... locality. This is not an open rating Amendment. So that is the reason we ask that this be brought back so that on the same day, that ah.... I could ask and give Representative Huff the opportunity to present this Amendment. That's the reason why I had asked that it be brought back.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Well, ah....., Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah... the hour is late and I would think that the Gentleman could ah.... take this out of the Record tonight and proceed....."

Speaker Redmond: "It's the privilege of the Chair that this be considered tomorrow. Some of the people have been here since seven o'clock this morning."

Huff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ah..... I have no problems deterring to that wish at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Fine, we'll take it up in the morning. Announcements. Representative Fary."

Fary: "On a Point of Personal Privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Fary: "I wish to sincerely thank Speaker Redmond and Senate President Partee for the kindness in allowing time for the Membership and the help here in the House and over in the Senate to pay premature tribute to John Fary last night at the Knights of Columbus Clubhouse on the Lake. It was a magnificent gathering of the finest people I have ever known. This old House of Representatives grows within you. You learn to love everybody and everything in it. My sincere thanks to the lobbyists for their generosity in making it possible for all in attendance to have a pleasant evening. I shall forever treasure your kindness and your respect. I thank you from the bottom of my heart. I would like to go in detail and reminisce a little bit, but I don't believe tonight is the proper time to do



it and talk about some of the good old days when I first came down some 21 years ago when our salaries were \$6,000 and we had no office. We filled our boxes for days and days and ah.... all those other things about the dancing girls coming in at four o'clock in the morning from the Lake Club. Because of the filibusters, we had no business.... they had no business out there. Everybody was over here. And the chicken they brought in by the bushel baskets and so on. There's some stories that I could tell that are sad and some that are humorous. However, I want you to know that I'm very deeply grateful for each and every one of you for coming last night and participating and I shall forever remember it. A special thanks to you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of a Motion, if it's in order, Mr. Speaker. Ah..... I would move that we suspend Rule 18 of the House in order to hear the following Bill. In the Appropriations II Friday morning at 8:00 AM on the House Floor. House Bill 835, which was continued from today. Senate Bill 347, which is the Local Government Officers' Training Bill. Senate Bill 348. The Liquor Control. Senate Bill 556. Public Health and Senate Bill 1496, which is the judicial appropriation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, let the Record show that I object to the Motion regarding House Bill 835."

Speaker Redmond: "Record will so show. Any further Announcements? Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, could I add to the announcement for the ah.... sponsors of these Bills. I don't know if they're on the House Floor or perhaps in their office, but I want to let them know one thing. Tomorrow, as I understand the Chairman, tomorrow's meeting of Appropriations II and Monday's meeting of Appropriations II is it, so if your Bill is on this list, it's only five Bills, and you're not there to get it heard, your Bill is in real jeopardy. Tomorrow and Monday is the last meetings of Appropriations II as I understand right now in the plan. So I would suggest that if it's one of these



Bills, you be there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, will the Vice chairman of Appropriations II guarantee a quorum?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purpose of an Announcement, there will be a meeting of the Republican Members of Appropriations I at 7:30 tomorrow morning in Room 622 in the State Capitol."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Announcements? Representative Shea. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for purposes of an announcement. Appropriations I will meet tomorrow morning at eight o'clock in Room 114 for the purpose of hearing two Bills. Hopefully, those Bills will come out tomorrow. House Bill 1947 and 1958. That's for the DOT appropriation. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I have a Motion if it would be in Order. Ah... I think it would be very brief. Mr. Speaker, ah.... I have a Motion regarding House Bill 2273, to take it from the Table and place it on the interim study calendar of the Committee on Transportation. This Motion has been cleared with the Leadership on both sides of the aisle, and ah.... I would appreciate a roll call vote on this Motion, taking 107 votes, to ah.... pass. House Bill 2273."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on the Calendar. Where is it?"

Dunn: "Well, I was told by the parliamentarian it takes 107 votes. I'll be satisfied....."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Motion. All in favor of the Motion, vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. He asked for a Record Roll Call. I'm not going to fight with the Members on this side. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 120 'aye', no 'nay'. The Motion carries. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now stand in adjournment until 10:30 AM tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Motion. All in favor, indicate by



JUN 19 1975

263.

by saying 'aye'. No."

Shea: "10:30."

Speaker Redmond: "The House is now adjourned."

