

Speaker Redmond: "Let the record show that Representative Geo-Karis is in her seat, but that she hasn't been joined by a sufficient number of her colleagues so we'll have to stand at ease for a while. The House will come to order and the members will please be in their seats. The Doorkeeper make the announcements, please. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "All those not entitled to this House floor, will you please retire to the gallery? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be led in prayer by Reverend Krueger, the Chaplain of the House."

Krueger: "Before I begin my prayer, I wish to apologize for my bit of incoherency yesterday. I am under medication at the hospital and ah... I never know when it's going to take effect and it did right as I came up here and I do apologize if you didn't understand what I was saying. In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; Amen. Oh, Lord, Bless this House this day, Amen. Every night Roman Catholic nuns and patients in the Holy Ghost Hospital in Waterford Ireland remember King Henry VIII in their prayers. The custom goes back to 1545 when the king made a gift of the hospital to the people of Waterford on condition that a Rosary be said for him each night. The hospital is operated by St. John of God nuns who along with the patients have maintained their side of the bargain. Let us pray. Oh, Lord, we implore Thy grace and protection for this day. Keep us temperance, keep us tempered in all things, diligent in our callings. Give us patience under our problems. Give us grace to be just and upright in all our dealings, quiet and peaceable, full of compassion and ready to do good to all men according to our abilities and opportunities. Direct us in all our ways. Defend us from all dangers and adversities and be graciously pleased to take us and all who are dear to us under Thy Fatherly care and protection. These things and whatsoever else Thou shall see to be necessary and convenient to us, we humbly beg to the merits and mediation of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, Our Lord and Savior. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll call for attendance. Representative Hart."

Hart: "Ah... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Friedrich and I would like to advise the House that Centralia and Benton are



still in the state tournament, but Lawrenceville is not."

Speaker Redmond: "Should I ask the chaplain to return and say a prayer for Lawrenceville? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have been subjected to an unmerciful needling by my great friend, Richard Hart and John Hirschfeld and some other self-appointed wits in this House concerning the tragic demise of the Lawrenceville Indians last evening. The thrust of their comments has been that the state champs can't hit major league pitching. Well, I want to say to you, and I want to say to them that it's the measure of the greatness of the Lawrenceville Indians that they can meet with triumph and disaster and treat those two imposters just the same. And I want to predict to you that sphinx-like they'll rise from the ashes. You just wait til next year and I want to say to you that when we had this organization, remember we folded the flag and put it away. I'm asking the Secretary of State to fly the flag over this Capital at half mast throughout this day and the final thought that I want to leave with you is this. That if they had to be beaten, I'm glad that they were beaten by Mt. Carmel, which is from the 54th District rather than to be beaten by a lesser breed. And I want to say on behalf of everybody who believes in the Lawrenceville Indians, we appreciate your sympathy and your understanding and it'll be reciprocated. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'd just like to add to the gentlemen from Lawrence if that's the same speech that he made after the election in November with the substitution of the Republican party for the Lawrenceville Indians?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the gentleman care to respond?"

Cunningham: "Well, unhappily the Lawrenceville Indians are still stronger than the Republican party."

Speaker Redmond: "There being 160 members present answering the roll call, a quorum of the House is present. House Bills 2nd Reading. We're going to call the Bills in order and then advance them... House Bill 20. Will you read the Bill?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 20, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to marriages. One Committee Amendment."



Amendment number 1. Amends House Bill 20 on page 1, line 11 by deleting 21 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Deuster in the chamber? Take it out of the record. House bill 37."

O'Brien: "House Bill 37."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Brinkmeier in the chamber? Might as well take that one out, too. House Bill 47."

O'Brien: "House Bill 47, Grotberg."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Grotberg in the chamber? Take it out of the record. 50, House Bill 50."

O'Brien: "House Bill 50, Grotberg."

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

O'Brien: "House Bill 84, Shea."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea's in the chamber. Will you read the Bill?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 84, a Bill for an Act making appropriation of the Secretary of State and repealing a certain Act named therein. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. House Bill 91."

O'Brien: "House Bill 91, Deuster."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster in the chamber? Take it out of the record. House Bill 98."

O'Brien: "House Bill 98, Tim Simms. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Illinois Legislative Investigation Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends House Bill 98 on page 1 by deleting line 17 and 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Committee Amendment number 1. It simply removes the words 'and other'. I move the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Simms has moved



the adoption of... All in favor signify by saying 'aye';
opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Third Reading. Any further Amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment number 2, Shea. Amends House Bill 98 on
page 3, line 1 and 2 by deleting 'county and municipal'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah...

Amendment number 2 deletes the words 'counties and municipal-
ities' from the Bill and ah... I've talked to the sponsor.

He has no objections, ah... no objections to it and I would
move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will the gentleman yield?"

Schlickman: "What is the effect of this Amendment?"

Shea: "The language of the Bill, when it was drafted, said 'in
demand and receive assistance from all state public officials'.
The Bill, when it was drafted inserted the words, 'county
and municipal officials' in there and I've discussed with Mr.
Rock and Mr. Simms and they ah... It was not the intent when
it was drafted to make it that broad and this Amendment deletes
the words, 'counties and municipal'."

Schlickman: "Are you implying that crime is only prevalent at
the State level and not at the county and municipal level."

Shea: "Certainly not implying that."

Schlickman: "Well, if we have a Commission for the purpose of
investigating crime, why... Why would you restrict the power
of this Commission to extend assistance to and demand and
receive assistance from only State public officials and not
county and municipal?"

Shea: "It's my understanding from Senator Rock that it was not
the intention of the Commission to expand its powers that far.
And I don't see any need to expand the powers of the Commission
that far and that's why I'm attempting to amend it. I've
talked to some people on both sides of the aisle and they



think that the, the Commission had enough powers as it was."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion. Representative Friedrich, Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think this is a bad Amendment and I would like to see this language left in the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The gentleman has moved for the adoption of... Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have a copy of this Amendment on my desk."

Speaker Redmond: "Have the Amendments been... I've been advised that it's not been printed, yet. We'll have to take this out of the record. House Bill 116. House Bill 116..."

O'Brien: "House Bill 116."

Speaker Redmond: "The sponsor is not here. We'll take it out of the record. 186."

O'Brien: "House Bill 186."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber in the chamber."

O'Brien: "Leinenweber."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second. House Bill 218."

O'Brien: "House Bill 218, Shea."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? There's a floor Amendment, I understand."

O'Brien: "Amendment number 1, Shea. Amends House Bill 218 on page 2 by deleting line 24 thru 33 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Has this Amendment been distributed? I've been advised that it's being distributed right now. Who was the sponsor of this Amendment?"

O'Brien: "Shea."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this Bill



was a Bill that would provide tuition waivers for National Guardsmen ah... after they've been in the Guard one year. The Amendment was after the Committee Hearing, would expand this to have the ah... Guard be able to go, a member of the Guard be able to go to ah... private colleges as well as public institutions and at the suggestion of Representative Dyer was... The language was changed from 'he' to 'he or she'. I'd move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion. Representative Schlickman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Ah... Representative, I have no objection to ah... our consideration of the adoption Amendment. I just wonder if by Third Reading, you'll have a fiscal note."

Shea: "Are you requesting one?"

Schlickman: "What?"

Shea: "Are you requesting one?"

Schlickman: "I am hereby requesting a fiscal note because it will involve the expenditure of State money. And I think we should before being called to vote on this measure, know what the fiscal impact is going to be."

Shea: "I can tell you what the people from the Board of Higher Education, er... not the Board of Higher Education from the Scholarship Commission told me it would cost."

Schlickman: "Well, let's follow the rules and have a fiscal note prepared or filed."

Shea: "I would be very happy to."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentlemen is... Representative Shea."

Shea: "I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "You said Third Reading. I think that Bill is to stand



on Second Reading until we, the sponsor provides the fiscal note.

Is that not correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Ah... I thought Gene said he had no objection to moving it to Third Reading and... "

Walsh: "If he doesn't have objection, I do until the fiscal note is provided."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll hold it on Second Reading until the fiscal note is supplied. 263."

O'Brien: "House Bill 263, VanDuynes."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative VanDuynes... Will you read the Bill?"

O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. 278. Is Representative Jaffe on the floor?"

O'Brien: "278, Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second Reading. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, as the principal co-sponsor of that Bill, ah... I ah... offer the ah... Amendment number 1, which was ah... introduced in Committee and approved by Committee. Ah... the ah... Amendment ah... ah... "

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder if the Clerk will read the Bill first and then you'll explain the Amendment."

Peters: "Okay."

O'Brien: "House Bill 278, a Bill for an Act to prohibit the exclusion of coverage for the treatment of injuries resulting from rape and accidents and health insurance policies and hospital services. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends, Amendment number 1 amends House Bill 278 on page 1 by deleting line 10-15 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this



Bill is a product of the Rape Study Commission. Ah... as indicated by the Clerks reading, it does address itself to the problem of the ah... insurance coverage and treatment of ah... rape victims. The Amendment was approved by the Department of Insurance. Did clean up ah... some technicalities ah... in the Bill. Ah... and was ah... approved unanimously by the insurance, by the Insurance Department and the Committee on Insurance. If there are any questions to any particulars of the Amendment or the Bill itself, I'd be happy to answer them and I move passage of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion on the Amendment? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, the only comment I have to make is that while the Calendar says this is Wednesday, March 5, 1975 I have the feeling that it's June 29, 1975. We have no copies of these Amendments and I do with all deference to the sponsors, object to their consideration violation of the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, have the Amendments been prepared and distributed? Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I have yet to see a copy of an Amendment that we've discussed this morning until after action has been taken on it. Seems to me that we ought to have these to ah... read and review while we're debating. The Amendment we're discussing right now, I don't have. I wish I could have it before I have to vote on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. We'll have to hold this up until the Amendments have been distributed. Mr. Clerk, I understand that they have been prepared and they were available yesterday. Is that correct? Will we do whatever we have to do to make sure they're distributed? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, these Amendments are very important and they were not on our desk yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll correct that. Will the Chief Pages, both Republican and Democrat, report to the Clerk? We don't



have a Page on the floor. Maybe they've all resigned. What good would it do? Well, let's take some Bills that don't have Amendments in the mean time. We'll have to straighten this matter out. House... Take that one out of the record and hold it on Second Reading. House Bill 295. Does that have any Amendments? Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 295."

O'Brien: "House Bill 295, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation of the Auditor General. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill 307."

O'Brien: "House Bill 307, Friedland. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Representative McMasters. McMasters."

McMasters: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I think we discussed in Committee the ah... both sides of the aisle, on the Committee the possibility of an Amendment to this Bill. I would for that reason would like to ask the sponsor if he would hold it for a day until we do have the opportunity to get that Amendment prepared and distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the pleasure of the sponsor? Representative Friedland. Way in the back there."

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the sponsor what the Amendment he added, he's talking about."

McMasters: "Well, it's difficult to explain an Amendment right now, John and ah... explain it again when we present it. I think that we can settle this whole thing in a very short order by ah... asking you to hold the Bill for a day or so."

Friedland: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on Second Reading. House Bill 313.

Any Amendments? We'll hold it on Second Reading. House Bill 335. Has the Amendment on that one been distributed? House



Bill 352, Read the Bill."

O'Brien: "House Bill 352, Catania. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation of the Commission on the Status of Women. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. House Bill 371. Read the Bill."

O'Brien: "House Bill 371, a Bill for an Act to vacate ah... and release and easement for highway purposes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. House Bill 420."

O'Brien: "House Bill 420."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to conform certain charitable trusts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. House Bill 116. Representative Satterthwaite."

O'Brien: "House Bill 116, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment number 1, Satterthwaite."

Speaker Redmond: "Has this been distributed? I've been advised that it's been distributed."

O'Brien: "Amends House Bill 116 on page 6 by deleting line 31 thru 34 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendments that are proposed for Bill 116 are not substantive kinds of changes. They came about because the Reference Bureau went back thru that Bill and the original Election Code and found that there were some discrepancies in their transcripts and so these suggestions that we have as Amendment number 1 are just clerical kinds



of things to bring it in conformity to the original Election Code. With the exception of line 11, on the Amendment which strikes the word 'if' and substitutes the word 'is'. And this change is being made because the original text in the Election Code was inaccurate there."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you moving the adoption of the Amendment?
Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but we don't have copies of this Amendment. We do have a copy of an Amendment for 117, but not 116 which is now under consideration. We don't have it."

Speaker Redmond: "Do the members have copies of this Amendment? Have you seen the Amendment, Representative Schlickman? Well, we'll have to hold this on Second Reading then. I wish the Clerk would make sure that these Amendments are distributed. House Bill 117. Will you read the Bill?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 117, Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment number 1, Satterthwaite. Amends House Bill 117 on page 7 after line 20 by inserting the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "The lady is recognized as regards to the Amendment."

Satterthwaite: "Again, Mr. Speaker, these are Amendments to bring the Bill into conformity with the original Election Code and the same holds true in the change on line 5 at the bottom of that Amendment sheet which changes the word 'if' to the word 'is' in order to correct the original text of the Election Code."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Moving the adoption of the Amendment?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the motion to adopt. All



in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Third Reading. House Bill 20. We've gone through the Second Readings once and we're going to go back and start at the beginning and pick those up that we had to pass because of the absence of the sponsor. House Bill 20. Representative Deuster. I saw Representative Deuster enter the chamber a while ago. Is he here now? Hold that on Second Reading then. House Bill 37. Representative Brinkmeier's in his chair. Will you read the Bill?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 37, Brinkmeier. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation for certain ordinary and contingent expense, the Supt. of Public Instruction. Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Amendment number 1 amends House Bill 37 on line 2 and 3 by deleting the word 'Supt. of Public Instruction' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Supt. of Education' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, this merely is a housecleaning Bill changing the name from office of Supt. of Public Instruction to the I.O.E. I move for the adoption of Amendment number 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The gentleman has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment number 1 to House Bill 37. The question is on the motion to adopt. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'no'. The 'aye'... the 'ayes' have it. The motion is carried. The Amendment is adopted."

O'Brien: "Amendment number 2 amends House Bill 37 as amended on line 15 by deleting 160,000 and inserting in lieu thereof 62,400."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House. This is exactly what this Amendment does. It reduces the amount from 160,000 down to 62,400 and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "No copies of the Amendments have been distributed



in this area, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been called to my attention that there seems to be a breakdown on the Minority Pages. We don't have any Republican Pages to distribute the Bills. I don't know whether... Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think we have another problem. The Pages are not putting the Bills in numerical order in and it takes about a half an hour to find a Bill. I spoke to the powers to be and I hope that'll be corrected."

Speaker Redmond: "The point is well taken. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I, Mr. Speaker, I ah... had a question of the, the ah... of the sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will yield."

Hoffman: "You move the figure from 160,000 to 62,000. Is this appropriation, am I to assume then that the appropriation is for a contract ah... and relationships already made and we are in fact paying for them."

Brinkmeier: "Well, Mr. Hoffman, I'm not sure I heard your question, but very briefly, initially this was included in the O.S.P.I. budget. It was an Amendment that was added on last spring. Subsequently, it was line item vetoed by the Governor. This part again, I selected to... It provided initially for on-campus health courses for health teachers or extension courses for health teachers and service and also workshops. Because of the time, the money could not be utilized for the extension or the on-campus, but it still if it is passed soon enough, it could be utilized this summer to train health teachers. And that is why the reduction from 160,000 down to 62,400."

Hoffman: "All right, thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Have the Amendments been distributed? Amendment 2 has not been distributed, I understand."

O'Brien: "37."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I now have a copy of Amendment number 2



which reduces the amount from 160,000 to 62,400."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Does the gentleman move the adoption of Amendment number 2? The question is on the motion to adopt. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion is, the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. The Amendments on House Bill 47, have they been distributed? No, hold it on Second Reading. How about 50? How about... Hold that on Second Reading. I understand that the Democrats do have the Amendment but there's a breakdown in the distribution system on the other side and I would suggest that maybe the Minority Leader, Representative Walsh, would arrange to see that the Amendments are distributed. Representative Ryan. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, our Pages tell us that they're up to date with the material that they have to pass out. In other words, they haven't got any more to pass out."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Selcke, will you investigate that serious situation? I understand that some are in the process of being distributed now. Would that include ah... 47 and 50? Do you know? We'll go the order of House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 97. Representative Fleck in the chamber."

O'Brien: "House Bill 97, Fleck. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Court of Claims Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, the other day when we discharged Committee, I had to explain what this Bill does and I'll do it again. When I handled the, when I had handled the pay raise Bill for the Directors and various Agency heads way last session, it went over to the Senate and the Senate put an Amendment on it cutting the various pays as it passed out of the House. Well, when it got to the Senate, the Judges of the Court explained, not only got the proposed salary increase cut, but they got their



present salary cut. Right now, er... last session rather they were making \$16,000 a year. The Senate put an Amendment on it to cut their salary to \$12,000 a year when the Amendment should have read in the Senate \$19,000. So, presently the Judges of the Court of Claims are making less money, \$3,000 less this year than they did last year. This is merely remedial Legislation to bring the Judges of the Court of Claims salary up to the level which they were supposed to have received in the Legislation which passed out of here last session. I simply ask for the support of the House in passing this measure over to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 97 pass. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Record roll call. Representative Fary. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. This Bill... Representative Laurino 'aye', Giglio 'aye', Barnes 'aye'. Geo-Karis is on the Democratic side again. She votes 'aye'. Representative Hanahan 'aye', McMaster 'aye'. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority is declared passed. The order of Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 34. Representative... Will you read the Bill, please?"

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 34, Brandt. A Bill for an Act to repeal a certain appropriation of the Capitol Development Board and make like appropriations of Secretary of State for the same purpose. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt."

Brandt: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, members of the House, Senate Bill 34 as amended transfers four million dollars from the Capitol Development Bond Fund to the Secretary of State for Rehabilitation of the State Capitol Building including the renovation of the State chambers and other improvements. A copy of a breakdown of items covering the expenditures was distributed to each member of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question... Representative Totten,



Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the sponsor would yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman indicates he will."

Totten: "John, I can't quite understand that we're repealing an Act that originally gave the ah... money to the Capitol Development Board, giving it to the Secretary of State and now we're amending it to give it back to the Capitol Development Board. Ah... Just looking at it on the surface, why do we need the Bill?"

Brandt: "The purpose of that was that ah... was because of originally the money was supposed to come from the General Revenue Fund. However, the ah... the Governors office, Mr. Mike Goldberg and the leaders of both parties agreed that they would, instead of taking it from the General Revenue Fund, it would come back from, it would be taken from the Capitol Development Bond Fund. And then transfer to the Secretary of State's office."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion?"

Totten: "Now, now, wait a minute now. Wasn't it originally in the previous Act that was passed the money taken from the Capitol Development Bond?"

Brandt: "Originally, originally ah... most of this moneys were, were ah... appropriated from the Secretary of State's office in 1974. However, in 1975 the Secretary of State's office failed to include the money needed to complete the work in the Capitol Building so they failed to appropriate in 1975 and that is the reason why we have to take action on this, Senate Bill 34 in order for us to make, to complete our work in the Capitol Building and also for the renovation of the Senate chambers."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 34 pass. All in favor indicate by voting 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Will you open up the... The question is shall Senate Bill 34 pass. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 125 'ayes', 5 'nays' and the Bill



having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, First Reading. Read the Bill."

O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 85, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to County Zoning. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Second Reading. Oh, Committee on Assignments, pardon me. The order of business is introduction of First Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 604, Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to investigation and prevention of fire and dangerous conditions. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 605, Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 606, Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 607, Sangmeister. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Housing Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 608, Rayson-Greiman. A Bill for an Act to modernize, clarify and codify the laws relating to marriage, annulment, separate maintenance and divorce. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 609, Tipsword. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the Privilege Tax on mobile homes. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 610, Tipsword. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 166, Maragos. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning the retention for use of litigation of x-ray film. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The order of business is Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution... "

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, pardon me. Representative Fary."

Fary: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, ah... I ask for the suspension of the proper rule. There could be 18, Lechowicz tells me, in regard to his hearing Bills in Labor and Commerce Committees today. Ah... they don't appear on the Calendar and they were post-



poned. As ah... House Bills 79, 87, 173, 257, and 324. Now apparently, there's been some controversy in regard to this. Ah... the Bills were originally posted properly and they were heard, er... offered to be heard at the Committee Hearing last week and postponed. Now, ah... they don't appear on the Calendar today and ah... I ask you Mr. Speaker, that the, I be given the ah... privilege of ah... sending them in for a Hearing today. I was, I was under the impression that ah... once it's postponed, after the witness have been heard automatically ah... everybody knows that, concerned and regard thereto, that those Bills will be heard on the next Committee Meeting day which is today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, may I address my query to Representative Fary?"

Speaker Redmond: "You may."

Geo-Karis: "Ah... John, which number are you talking about? Is that the Emil Jones Bill?"

Fary: "Ah... Representative Geo-Karis, I'm talking about five Bills that were postponed. House Bills 79, 87, 173, 257, and 324. They were all postponed until the next meeting of the Labor and Commerce Committee which is today. Now, none of them appear on the, on the House Calendar. Ah... there are ah... three other Bills posted for today. Scheduled, but ah... these Bills are not on the Calendar and I assumed that, as you know, you were there last week, that when it is postponed that the postponed be on the Calendar."

Geo-Karis: "Well, do you have any objection, John, if we postpone them until next week? I don't and since I'm a Minority Spokesman, I'd be very happy to concur on a postponement until next week."

Fary: "Ah... ah... Adeline, I think these Bills should be on the Calendar today and if there're any proponents or opponents who want them to be heard, like we did last week, and then, if they request to postpone them, then we'll do it."



Geo-Karis: "But the reason I... "

Fary: "But, I don't think we ought to bypass today."

Geo-Karis: "No, I'm not trying to bypass it. But by the same token, I had a Bill up last week and I agreed to postponement for a week on it and I didn't find it on the Calendar. Therefore, I didn't call any witnesses there, so, and I can't do it now. And I, is there any harm in postponing this for another week. I mean, do you have a... if you feel there is, I won't disagree with you, but I just thought I'd ask you."

Fary: "It's your Bill and if you want to, when you want to postpone it ah... at the Committee ah... refer it to Committee, we'll consider it at that time. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, if this was a bad idea, it's far worse today because there's a lot less notice. The gentleman proposes that we hear these very important Bills this afternoon. So, instead of 24 hours notice, we're giving those people who might wish to testify for or against these Bills and I suspect... I suspect that those who're in favor of it, are sitting in the gallery or within the sound of our voice and ah... are fully aware that they'll be up. I wonder, though, if ah... the people who might be opposed to them might be interested in ah... and I just think it's patently unfair for us to ah... set these Bills for a Hearing this afternoon. There's no point in having rules at all if we suspend such as an important provision as this. That provision which gives people notice of pending Legislation. I think we owe it to our constituents to ah... post these Bills, hear them in the prescribed time, and ah... be about our business."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fary."

Fary: "My dear Mr. Walsh, this is simple arithmetic. The Bills were called for a Hearing last week and postponed until this week. Now, everybody is aware of the fact that they've been



postponed. The people are here. The people are here, the proponents and the opponents. They're fully aware of the fact that they were postponed until today."

Walsh: "I object, Mr. Speaker. And I suggest to you that there might very well be people who are unaware of what we're doing here today and ah... for example, may know what happened yesterday. That the Bills were postponed and were to have been heard one week from today. Now, that was the decision we made yesterday and I think that it's showing bad faith for us to go back on that decision."

Fary: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask that these Bills be called in Committee today and ah... if there are proponents or opponents, we'll be very happy to listen to them as we did last week. And should the sponsor of the Bills request a postponement until next week, it'll be considered."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, in as much as the Minority, I'm the Minority Spokesman on the Labor and Commerce Committee, I would have no objection to them being called as long as I understood from the Chairman that they would be automatically postponed because of the lack of proper notice. I feel that it's very incumbent upon us to give proper notice to the public. And we haven't got it given and I know in my own case of one Bill because I did not see it and it was not supposed to be on ah... I haven't got my witnesses here. Now, I'm just one person, but I think; forget about my Bill. I think it is only right and I don't always agree with Representative Walsh, but just this one time I feel he is right about the notice situation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Fary."

Fary: "I will agree to whatever ah... Representative Geo-Karis has said to postpone this until the next week. However, I do intend to call the Bills today because they were postponed until today. Now, should ah... if Adeline wants to ah... continue with her postponement for another week, there's no



objection whatsoever by the Chair, by the ah... Labor Committee Chairman."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that? I didn't quite get your point, Representative Fary. What is your position with respect to your motion to suspend the rules in the light of the objection in the light of... "

Fary: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, may we please take this out of the record and postpone them until next week."

Speaker Redmond: "Then, then, you're withdrawing your motion to..."

Fary: "Those five Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "You're withdrawing your motion to suspend the rules. Is that correct?"

Fary: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, there's nothing there. Now, the order of business is ah... House Joint Resolutions on the Speakers Table. House Joint Resolution 10. Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, House Joint Resolution number 10 would recreate the Dirksen Commission. Very briefly, what has happened some of you will recall, we did appropriate the money for the statutes last year. Subsequently, the ah... Director of the Department of General Services refused to make payment on the basis that the specifics of the statutes had not been spelled out properly. So, it was their request, the Department of General Services request that we recreate this Commission so that they can spell out the specific guidelines authorizing proper payment and I would urge the adoption of House Joint Resolution 10."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The gentleman has moved the adoption of House Joint Resolution 10. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. It's adopted. S. J. R. Eleven, Representative Lemke, did you desire that to ah... Lemke and McCourt. Senate Joint Resolution 11. Stands today the recording of the Spanish Speaking People Study Commission. Any discussion? He moves the adoption of the Senate Joint Resolution 11. All in favor indicate by



saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. It's adopted. Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 109, Lundy. House Resolution 110, Hart. House Joint Resolution 15, Hart et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment of Bills. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 20."

O'Brien: "House Bill 20, Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to marriages. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Are there any floor Amendments?"

O'Brien: "One Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the Committee Amendment."

Deuster: "There are no Amendments that I know of and as far as I'm concerned, you can go to... "

O'Brien: "One Committee Amendment. Amendment number 1 amends House Bill 20 on page 1, line 13 by deleting 21 and inserting in lieu thereof the following, 18. And in line 13 by deleting 18 and inserting in lieu thereof the following, 16 and so forth."

Deuster: "Ah... yes, I would move the adoption of Amendment number 1. What this does is to conform the law relating to the age of marriage to the court decision which have required that the age be the same for males and females. The age for females has been 18 and the court has required that the age for males be the same. Ah... so, this conforms ah... the law in that respect. The second feature of this Amendment is that with respect to the pregnancy of females which is a ground for marriage. It had been a 'pro forma', a routine matter for a Court Order ah... to allow the marriage. Ah... the Amendment clarifies that with the proper affidavit, the County Clerks ah... may have the affidavits accepted and authorize the marriage without requiring that the couple and their parents go ah... up and see the Judge. This has the support of the County Clerks Association and that is one reason the Amendment was offered."



Speaker Redmond: "You move the adoption of the... "

Deuster: "I move the adoption of Amendment number 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The gentleman has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment number 1 to House Bill 20. All in favor... Representative Lundy, do you desire recognition? Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah... on the Amendment ah... does the Amendment change the requirement in the, the ah... original Bill, at least the original Bill as I read the summary from the Digest stating that the affidavit must state that the purpose of the marriage is merely, is not merely to give a name to the child?"

Deuster: "Ah... the Amendment does not change that at all and of course, that's in the statutes ah... presently and that is required for the Court Orders. Ah... the ah... synopsis of course, abbreviates the exact language."

Lundy: "Does the ah... proposed Amendment change the Bill with respect to the ah... legal age for marriage without consent of parents?"

Deuster: "Ah... yes, it does. And as indicated, as I suggested, it makes the age for males and females 18 without consent of parents and it makes the age uniform for males and females at 16 where they have the consent of their parents or guardians."

Lundy: "And in the original Bill the age without consent was 21. Is that right?"

Deuster: "That's right. It was amended and it conforms with all of the surrounding states ah... which have uniformly have 18."

Lundy: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. House Bill 47. Representative Grotberg."

O'Brien: "House Bill 47, Grotberg. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill."



One Committee Amendment. Amends House Bill 47 on page 2 by striking line 21-35 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. House Bill 47 merely brings the School Election Code paragraphs into ah... complete concurrence with the General Election Code regarding the handicapped and blind voter. The ah... subject came to my attention by several people who have had trouble voting in School Referendums with a guide dog, themselves and two Judges in a small polling booth. This allows a handicapped or blind or any other way handicapped person to take a friend or relative into the polling place with him at School Elections. That merely is what this does. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "You move the adoption of the Amendment."

Grotberg: "Oh, yes. I move the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Is there still preserved the provision that those Judges who assist disabled voters shall give no information regarding how the disabled voter voted?"

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Schlickman. I believe that you will find the ah.. confession of silence ah... is in the standing copy that follows this in the statutes, but I don't... which I don't have with me. It's a direct ah... insertion from the ah... Election Code."

Schlickman: "Well, my concern is that Amendment number 1 shows a deletion of the prohibition on giving no information and I just want to be assured that that prohibition on giving no information regarding how the disabled voter voted is preserved."

Grotberg: "Have you turned the page on the other side of the Amendment?"

Schlickman: "No."



Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Schlickman. It's kind of fun, Mr. Schlickman, to find you in such a stance because it doesn't happen very often. I commend you for catching the fact."

Schlickman: "Well, just a second now. I turned the page."

Grotberg: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Oh, I see."

Grotberg: "Shall thereafter give no information regarding the same, I believe."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Schlickman."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. House Bill 50."

O'Brien: "House Bill 50, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 50 by striking line 8-13 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg to explain the Amendment."

Grotberg: "Yes, again thank you Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I think that this little Amendment may be of interest to everybody in this room. It has to do with the Bill that I offered last year and was tied up on rules to reduce the size of the name of the County Clerk or the Election Commissioner on those polling booth signs within 100 feet of the polls or where the copy would be in one inch letters and the man's name or woman's would be in six inch letters. We have now revised it to even more. We're deleting the name of the Election Officer completely and this is an agreed Amendment on both sides of the aisle in Committee, at least. So that the only thing you'll see at the polling place now is the name of the officer in charge of that Election and no names. And it should come as interest to everyone in this room because it's deeply involved in the Election process and



MAR 5 1975

I would move the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell, Yourell. Yourell, pardon me. Ewell is not here yet. Pardon me."

Yourell: "Would the sponsor answer a question or two? John, some time ago, three or four years ago I believe it was, there was proposed Legislation that would provide that the elected public official of any office could not display his name in type larger than the office that he represented. Now, I don't recall exactly whatever happened to that, if it became Law or not, I think it did. It happened at a time when Governor Ogilvie was running for re-election and the road repair signs throughout the State of Illinois had his name in big, big type and the office of Governor was in very small type and as a result of that, Legislation was ah... presented to ah... insure that the officeholder's name was not in the same size type as the office, but rather in smaller type. Ah... can you tell about that. If this Bill is necessary that if that is ah... the case that we don't need this."

Grotberg: "Ah... thank you for the question, Representative Yourell. This amends the Election Code which is not a part of that process as I understand it. Ah... and some of those things came out in the Court Hearing by which, as I understand the Cook County ah... Election Commissioner had to go around and cut his name off the signs entirely. This eliminates the whole name, only the office."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. House Bill 91."

O'Brien: "House Bill 91, Deuster. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act authorizing certain counties to undertake local improvements. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

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



Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I'd like to hold that on the order of Second Reading because of a floor Amendment that is being drafted."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on the order of Second Reading. House Bill 98. Is the second Amendment ready?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 98."

Speaker Redmond: "Is the sponsor on the floor, Representative Simms? Representative Simms. Hold it on Second Reading. 116. Is that ready for discussion. Representative Satterthwaite. Read the Bill."

O'Brien: "House Bill 116. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment number 1, Satterthwaite. Amends House Bill 116 on page 6 by deleting line 31-34 and then inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I made the remark before and I'll repeat them briefly. There is no substantive kind of change in the proposed Amendment. It is being submitted because the Reference Bureau has reviewed the Bill as it was submitted before and found some technical errors. This simply brings it into conformity with the Election Code as it has been in the past. There is one deletion of the word 'if' to be changed to the word 'is' because there was an error in the original text of the Election Code and that is the only thing that has any substantive change."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The lady moved the adoption of the Amendment 1."

Satterthwaite: "I so move."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment 1 to House Bill 116. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted."



Third Reading. House Bill 186."

O'Brien: "House Bill 186, Leinenweber."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber in the chamber?

Hold it on Second Reading. Hold 190 on Second Reading. House Bill 218, I understand that the fiscal note has now been attached. Representative Shea. Representative Schlickman, any further question? Third Reading. House Bill 313. Is Rep... Will you read the Bill?"

O'Brien: "House Bill 313. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

O'Brien: "Amendment number 1, Fleck. Amends House Bill 313 by inserting below line 26 the following, Section 2, This Amendatory Act takes effect upon its becoming a law."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck to explain the Amendment."

Fleck: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, I don't know if it's been distributed yet. It has been? All right then I move the adoption of Amendment number 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment number 1 to House Bill 313. The question is on the motion to adopt. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendments's adopted. House Bill 335. Read the Bill."

O'Brien: "House Bill 335, Keller. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Horseracing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends House Bill 335 on page 3 by deleting all of line 25 and 26 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller."

Keller: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, all this Amendment does is change it from the Auditor to the Comptroller. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment number 1 to House Bill 335. Any discussion? You don't



have the Amendment? I think there's a plot afoot not to give the Amendments to Representative Schlickman. He indicates that he now has the Amendment. The question, the question is on the adoption of Amendment number 1 to House Bill 335. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. 353."

O'Brien: "House Bill 353, Byers. A Bill for an Act to restore access rights property adjacent to Federal Aid Route 12 in Madison County. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 353 on page 3 by inserting directly after line 26 the following, Section 3, This Act takes effect upon its becoming a Law."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers is recognized in connection with the Amendment. Committee Amendment number 1."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of the House. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment number 1 to House Bill 353. Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of Amendment number 1 to House Bill 353. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. Is Representative Leinenweber in the Chamber? House Bill 278."

O'Brien: "House Bill 278. A Bill for an Act to prohibit the exclusion of coverage for the treatment of injuries resulting from rape. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 278 on page 1 by deleting line 10-15 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe is recognized in connection with Amendment number 1."

Jaffe: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, this is an Agreed Amendment between the Department of Insurance, the Insurance Companies and the sponsors of the Bill. Basically, what the Amendment does is that it makes the following changes. It adds the Section amending the Voluntary Health Services Plan Act which is the



Rockford Blue Cross. It includes protection against the reduction of coverage as well as exception or exclusion from coverage. It includes examination, a treatment from trauma among those items which cannot be excluded from coverage. It includes victims of attempted rape among those who's expenses cannot be exempted from coverage and it clarifies the definition of accident health insurance and group accident health insurance and I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment number 1 to House Bill 278. Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. House Bill 98. Representative Simms. House Bill 98."

O'Brien: "Amendment number 2, Shea. Amends House Bill 98 on page 3 lines 1 and 2 by deleting 'county and municipal'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendments have been distributed and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment number 2 to House Bill 98. Discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm sorry, Jerry, I'm not quite sure where we are here. Could you explain what it does, again?"

Shea: "It deletes the word 'counties and municipalities'. Right."

Skinner: "Why were those two words in there to start with or three words?"

Shea: "Pardon me?"

Skinner: "Why were they there to start with?"

Shea: "That's what we're trying to find out. I've talked to Mr. Rock and Mr. Sevcik and Mr. Simms and it was not the intention of any member of the Commission or the Commission to expand the power ah... that far."

Skinner: "Oh, well I think it would be a good idea to expand it that far."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on



the adoption of Amendment number 2 to House Bill 98. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Third Reading. Any further Amendments, oh no... Message from the Senate. Message from the Senate."

O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution, to wit. House Joint Resolution 13, concurred in by the Senate, March 5, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sangmeister, what's your pleasure in connection with House, House Bill 217? You have a motion on that to take it from the Speaker's Table. It's on the Speaker's Table there. On the right side. Hold it. We have an announcement. We are now going to go into a perfunctory session and come back on the floor at five minutes to 12. This will permit the members to have lunch and in the meantime, we will go to ah... First, introduction of First Order. Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Ah... Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Committee Hearing will be cancelled this week. All the witnesses have been notified and we will hold the hearing next week."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that we can only have a half an hour for lunch because the Governor will be in here at noon. So, we'll be in recess, in perfunctory session rather and we'll go to the order of introduction and First Reading, but you can repair to where ever you repair to, to have lunch and be back here at ten minutes to 12. Introduction to First Reading, Mr. Clerk."

O'Brien: "House Bill 612, Lundy et al. A Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Welfare and Rehabilitation Service Planning Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 613, Stubblefield et al. A Bill for an Act to require that the packaged price of consumer commodities be clearly posted thereon and to provide for



a penalty for the violation thereof. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 614, Greiman et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 615, Meyer et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act providing for the organization, operation of mosquito abatement districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 616, Madigan et al. A Bill for an Act to regulate Real Estate Appraisers. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 617, Bradley et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Housing Authorities Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 618, Ewell. A Bill for an Act in relation to medical treatment administered solely for the purpose of prolonging human life. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 619, Ewell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 620, Jaffe et al. A Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts with respect to registration and election procedures for school elections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 621, McClain et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Selcke: "Ah... House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment number 12, Mudd et al. Resolved by the House of Representatives, 79th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein. There shall be submitted to the electors of this State at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend Section 4, Article 9, Constitution of the State of Illinois by the addition of a new paragraph (D) to read as follows: Article 9, Revenue Section 4. Real property taxation (D). The General Assembly may provide by law, for incentives for the rehabilitation or improvement of residential real estate to deferral of and increase in the assessment of that real estate. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Ah... House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment number 13, Friedrich et al. Resolved by the House of Representatives,



79th General Assembly, State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, there shall be submitted to the electors of this State the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend Section 2 of Article 10 of the Constitution to read as follows: Article 10, Education Section 2, Superintendant of Public Instruction. A Superintendant of Public Instruction shall be elected by electors of the State and shall hold office for 4 years beginning on the 2nd Monday of January after his election. To be able to hold the office of Superintendant of Public Instruction a person must be a United States Citizen, at least 25 years old, and a resident of this State for three years preceeding his election. The Superintendant of Public Instruction shall be the chief educational officer of the State having general supervisory responsibility in relation to public, elementary and secondary schools. And shall accept as limited by Law, establish goals, determine policies, provide for planning and evaluating education programs, recommend financing and have such other duties and powers as provided by Law. Schedule. The Superintendant of Public Instruction shall be elected at the General Election next occurring after the General Election at which this Amendment is approved by the electors. He shall take his oath on the 2nd Monday of January after his election at which time the State Board of Education shall cease to exist. First Reading of the Constitutional Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Announcement for the members in the offices and down in the Rathskeller that the Joint Session will convene at 12:00 and it's now ten minutes to 12. You'll get shut out. The Joint Session of the 79th General Assembly will come to order. Will the members of the House and our esteemed guests from the Senate please be in their seats? Mr. Clerk, is there a quorum of the House present?"

O'Brien: "There is a quorum of the House present."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. President, is a quorum of the Senate present



in the chamber?"

President Partee: "Mr. Speaker, there is a quorum of the Senate present in the chamber."

Speaker Redmond: "There being a quorum of the House and a quorum of the Senate in attendance of the Joint Session is convened. Will the Clerk, are there, the order of Resolutions."

O'Brien: "Joint Session Resolution 3. Resolved that a Committee of 10 be appointed five from the House by the Speaker of the House, five from the Senate by the Committee on Committees of the Senate to await upon his excellency, Governor Daniel Walker, and invite him to address the Joint Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea is recognized with regard to the Joint Session Resolution number 3."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, I'd move that we do now adopt the Joint Session Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the gentleman's motion regarding Joint Session Resolution number 3. The question is on the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion is adopted. Pursuant to the Resolution the following are appointed as the Committee to escort the Chief Executive. The House appointees—Mulcahey, Darrow, J. M. Houlihan, Carroll and Meyer. The Senate has appointed Senator Lane, Senator Egan, Senator Hickey, Senator Regner, Senator Bloom. Will the Committee of escort convene at the rostrum and then retire to the rear of the chamber to await the Governor. I've been advised that ah... the first lady of Illinois, Mrs. Walker is in the gallery. Mrs. Walker is in the rear of the chamber. Doorman."

Doorman: "Mr. Speaker, the Governor and his party is at the door and wishes permission to come in."

Speaker Redmond: "Admit the honorable Governor. Members of the Joint Session, the honorable Governor of the State of Illinois, Dan Walker."

Governor Walker: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President,



members of the General Assembly, citizens of Illinois, as we approach the National Bicentennial, it is well to remind ourselves that for 200 years now, optimism and self-reliance have been the dominant American characteristic. That has been our heritage and that must be our future. Today, there are some who have departed from that heritage. There are those who doubt our ability to solve the grave problems which confront us. I am not one of those and I am sure, neither are you. I believe that this is a time for America to face the future with hope and with confidence. To mobilize our considerable resources, to make the hard choices, and to help those who need help. Working together, we can do our part at the State level. And it is in that spirit that I present the Fiscal 1976 Budget. It is a Budget which offers hope and help to people. Our two priorities are these. For the third year in a row there cannot be, there will not be any new State taxes or any increases in existing taxes. Second, second, we should use the growth in State revenues to ease the burdens of recession and to satisfy urgent human needs. To meet these priorities, I am recommending a Budget of \$2.5 billion for operations, \$5.9 billion for grants, and \$2.4 billion for capital. A total of almost \$10.8 billion. Operations, what is commonly thought of as State Government, actually accounts for less than one quarter of the State's resources. Over three quarters of the Budget, \$8.3 billion is allocated to grants and capital and these areas account for most of the increase. The grant dollars enable local units of government to provide education, police and fire protection and other needed services. Without those dollars, real estate taxes all over this State would be much higher. The capital dollars flow directly into the private sector, stimulating the local economy, providing needed facilities; roads, schools, health facilities and creating jobs. In the last two years, the Budgets were prepared in a time of rampant inflation. We had, then, to hold the line on spending, but



conditions have changed dramatically. Now, we are in a recession a deep recession. We have talked about maintaining a prudent balance, pointing out that like any family, we should save money for bad times; for a rainy day, if you will. And certainly this time, like no other time since World War II, is that rainy day. In January, unemployment in Illinois climbed to 6.2%. More than 300,000 people were out of work, up from 5.4% in December. Preliminary figures for February indicate that unemployment will go considerably higher. In my book, ladies and gentlemen, this is the rainy day that we've been protecting against. We must face these conditions. We must spend more time, more money to meet the increasing needs of people caught in a deepening recession. We are in a fiscal position to meet our responsibilities. There will be six hundred million dollars more in the General Fund from Revenue growth and the carry-over balance. And we do have the capacity to issue substantially more Bonds. Other industrial States with comparable problems are now facing the unacceptable alternative of cutting services or increasing taxes. Illinois does not face those alternatives. We can increase services in Illinois without increasing taxes. The highlights of the Budget are these. To help local units of government hold the line on property taxes while meeting their responsibilities, there will be aid to local school districts and other local governments totalling \$3.3 billion, an increase of 33%. That's equivalent to the total dollars provided to all local units of government by property taxes and without it, local property taxes would have to increase substantially. Second, to fight recession and at the same time meet vital human needs, there are appropriations of \$3.5 billion to implement the accelerated building program and other construction efforts. Third, to improve the quality of life for all and to help alleviate the burdens of the less fortunate, more pressing in this time of economic crisis, are there appropriations of \$1.7 billion for elementary and se-



condary education, \$810 million for higher education, \$202 million for the fight against crime, \$2.5 billion for transportation, \$94 million for direct services for working people, over 1 billion dollars for health including mental health and medic-aid, \$114 billion for child welfare, \$909 million for public aid grants, \$410 million to help clean up the environment and to increase outdoor recreational opportunities, \$28 million for consumer protection. We will continue our efforts in the Executive Branch to eliminate waste and to hold the line on spending for government operations under the Governor. Appropriations for all of those operations, even including mental hospitals and prisons, account for less than 13% of the total Budget. For the second year, we are presenting an accountability Budget. A Budget which translates dollars into services to people. We will continue to improve and to refine measures of performance to make them even more meaningful. For the first time, an agency's performance can be measured against the specific commitment made in last year's Budget document. In most cases, those objectives were met. In some cases, they were not met. But pointing out these facts is the heart of accountability. This is a balanced Budget. Recommended appropriations do not exceed available resources. At the same time, the Budget will utilize all of the resources available to us. This is a Budget that we can afford. But it is all that we can afford. It reflects hard choices, choices that were necessary. The State must not engage in deficit financing. Our Constitution, as you know, forbids it. This Budget contains requests for \$3.5 billion for Capitol construction and Capitol grants for the fiscal year to implement the accelerated building program. The portions of the program for housing, pollution control equipment and industrial development are all financed by Revenue Bonds, do not use State resources and therefore, are not included in the formal Budget. This program, as I have said before, will create jobs for thousands of Illinois workers in the private sector, while at the same time meeting impor-



tant human needs. It will provide safer highways, improved public transportation, rebuild or replace substandard schools, help clean up the environment, expand recreational areas, improve conditions for those who live in the State institutions, provide community facilities for the developmentally disabled and finance needed housing construction. This is not a make work program. Ask the farmer who loses an axle on the road to market if resurfacing rural roads is make work. Ask the commuter stuck in traffic if eliminating urban bottlenecks is make work. Ask the parents of children who must attend dangerous, unsafe schools if replacement or rehabilitation of those schools is make work. The accelerated building program is a program to meet the pressing needs of people. Since that program coincides with what may be a temporary lull in the raging pace of inflation and construction costs, it makes sense to meet those needs now. By building now, we can short-circuit inflation and save many millions of dollars in future construction costs. Even with the accelerated building program, total debt service, interest and principle repayment for State Bonds will amount to about 2.4% of General Revenue for fiscal '76. These costs can be managed readily in future years from growths in State revenues from existing sources. Further, construction payrolls and increased consumer spending will generate State tax revenues ranging from \$15 million to \$20 million for each five hundred million dollars in construction spending. Bond financing of the accelerated building program will not, I repeat, it will not require any increase in taxes. Some will argue, as they have, that we are saddling our children/debts. But that is a one-sided argument. We will provide our children with better schools, better hospitals, cleaner water, safer roads and improved public transportation facilities. And these facilities will be paid for as they are used. And I believe that that is sensible. Let us not shrink from our responsibility to attack the recession. Let us use our resources to help stimulate economic



recovery. Let us invest those resources in people to meet their needs, to provide help, to provide jobs for the hundreds of thousands of people who need jobs. Ladies and gentlemen, the time to act on the accelerated building program is right now. Education, I am requesting an additional \$287 million in State support for education at all levels. This represents over 70% of the projected growth in State general revenues for fiscal '76. For elementary and secondary education, I am recommending over \$1.6 billion, thereby approving the recommendations of the new State Board of Education. This is an increase of \$220 million over the current year's appropriations. And there will be full funding of the State distributive aid formula. Even in... But even full funding, and this is an important point for many people downstate, even full funding is not enough. Full funding would leave over 200 school districts, mostly downstate, with less money than they are receiving this year. That, I say to you, would be wrong. It would be unfair to the school children and to the taxpayers in those districts. To right that wrong, I am recommending that an additional \$20 million be appropriated to correct the inequities and increase the funding for those districts that need help. Increased State support will provide \$749 for each elementary and secondary school student. That is double the 1971 level of \$380. Three years ago, State support was 37% of total educational costs. This year, it will be 47%. For the first time, State support for education will equal the support that comes from local property taxes. And this, I think, is worth bearing in mind. Each additional dollar of State aid to local schools is a dollar that the local real estate taxpayer does not have to pay. And I do also want to point out that as a result of this ah... proposed appropriation in scattered districts around the State, full funding will cause some property tax rollbacks automatically in some districts. The State will be providing the most dollars and the highest level of support for education in our history.



Over the past three years, the level of funding for elementary and secondary education is up \$611 million without a tax increase and I think that's a fact that everyone can be justly proud of. But I do want to add that there is more to education than just money. It is the responsibility of the local districts and the State Board of Education to see that these additional dollars are spent wisely and effectively. They must be used in the classrooms to improve the quality of education for our children. For higher education, this Budget provides over \$1 billion. Eight hundred and ten million for operations and that's an increase of \$87 million. Again, there will be no tuition increases. State scholarship support will increase by 10% to over \$69 million. One hundred and eight thousand persons at both public and private institutions will receive scholarships. There many families in this State who have worked very hard to make a college education possible for their children only and particularly in recent years, to see their earnings and savings wiped out by inflation. Others now have to use those savings to tide themselves over a period of unemployment. Those people pay their taxes and they are entitled to scholarship help in keeping their kids in college. Community colleges will receive almost \$20 million in additional resources. This is an increase of over 18% and hereto, as you know, State aid will serve to offset increases in local property taxes. Health and Welfare. Appropriations for health and welfare total about \$2.5 billion. An increase of almost \$200 million over fiscal 1975. Support for community programs for the mentally ill, the developmentally disabled, for programs to treat alcoholism and drug abuse, will continue to increase. Today, more people need help with their problems. And for this reason, I am requesting \$93 million, including an increase of \$20 million to fund these community programs. We will make every effort to improve the lives of patients in our State institutions by increasing direct care staff, improving programs, staffing new institutions



and modernize existing ones. This Budget gives public aid an increase of \$129 million over last year's appropriation. Recession has increased the welfare roles and benefit levels have been increased in the current fiscal year. Included in this request are funds for a new 100% State funded grant program to help certain aged blind and disabled citizens who do not qualify for the Federal program. And I want to point out here today, that Illinois now ranks very near the top amongst all the States in the level of payments to welfare recipients. To improve the quality of child care in Illinois, the Department of Children and Family Services will require \$114 million an additional 8.6 million over last year's appropriation. The State is now meeting the full legitimate cost of child care provided by private agencies. Over the last two years, resources devoted to child welfare have increased by 32%. This increase is necessary to provide quality care for the 28,000 children who depend on us. Transportation. I am requesting \$2.5 billion, an increase of \$483 million for improved maintenance, intensified safety programs and for accelerated construction in fiscal '76. An additional \$160 million will be devoted to the supplemental freeway system. Over \$300 million will be devoted to widening and resurfacing substandard or narrow roads in both urban and rural areas, and for bridge repair and safety improvement. Improved public transportation is a key in our effort to conserve energy, curb pollution, and ease congestion. The State will expand its support of public transportation. \$7.4 million is recommended for downstate public transportation and the State will provide in this Budget, \$137 million in support of the Regional Transportation Authority in the Chicago Metropolitan area. Inter-city rail passenger service will receive increased aid totalling over \$8 million. In addition, 150 commuter and inter-city rail stations will be improved for safety and comfort under the accelerated building program. Personal Safety. As everyone here knows, the primary responsibility



for safety rests with local authorities. But the State does have a vital role to play; financing, co-ordinating, supporting these local efforts. This Budget recommends \$202 million to fight crime. \$43 million is recommended for the Law Enforcement Commission which makes grants to local police departments, prosecutors and other parts of the criminal justice system as well as for separate police training programs. \$62 million is recommended for the Department of Law Enforcement. The State Police, the I.B.I., the Crime Lab, the Bureau of Identification, and the Fire Marshall all provide vital support services to local police in addition to their efforts to fight drug traffic and organized crime. \$97 million is recommended for the Department of Corrections to improve the professional quality of prison staff and to house the growing adult population. \$28 million is recommended for the new Department of Consumer Affairs and Licensing and for other agencies which have major responsibilities for consumer protection such as insurance and the Commerce Commission. Particularly when the times are tough, the State has a real responsibility to do everything within its power to make certain that people get their money's worth for goods and services. Underlying this Budget with it's inevitable numbers and statistics is a faith. Faith in our country, faith in our heritage of self-reliance and optimism, in our ability to overcome problems and to improve our society. Over 40 years ^{ago} /in even more troubled times, Franklin D. Roosevelt said this, 'Failure is not an American habit and in the strength of great hope we must all shoulder our common load'. In this bicentennial year, ladies and gentleman, we can meet the challenges and work together; shouldering our common load to provide health and hope to the people of Illinois. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Committee of Escort come forward to the rostrum to escort the Governor from the chamber? The President of the Senate, the honorable Cecil Partee, is



recognized for a motion."

President Partee: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Joint Session do now arise."

Speaker Redmond: "The President has moved that the Joint Session do now arise. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Joint Session will arise. We're really not in Session, but we'll recognize Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, can I please be informed as to what time are we meeting tomorrow?"

Speaker Redmond: "10 o'clock."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be back in Session. The order of business is Committee Reports."

O'Brien: "Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 242 was referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do not pass. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 368 was referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 299 was referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Katz from the Committee on Judiciary II to which House Bill 275 was referred; reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass. Mr. Katz from the Committee on Judiciary II to which House Bill 379 was referred; reported the same back with Amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill, as amended, do pass."

Speaker Redmond: "The order of business is Agreed Resolutions."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 111, DePrima et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi on the Agreed Resolution. Representative Giorgi, Agreed Resolution number 111. Representative Giorgi. I think the rules provide that when a



gentleman is addressing the Speaker, the people should not stand between him and the Speaker. I think that's in the rules."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Agreed Resolution 111 honors ah... Alderman Vito Marzullo of Chicago, the loquacious and colorful Alderman, the Warden of Chicago and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of the Resolution. Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Announcements. Representative Lechowicz. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, there'll be a Budget Overview Session tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock on the House floor. I would ask that all members of Appropriations I and II, that's both Democrats and Republicans, to attend the meeting. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget will present his version of the \$11 billion Budget and he'll be open to questions as well. Any other interested member is invited to attend. Again, that's 8 o'clock tomorrow morning on the House floor. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz, for an announcement with respect to the Rules Committee."

Katz: "Ah... yes, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. Ah... as you ah... will recall from the letter you received from the Speaker last week ah... a meeting of the Rules Committee will take place this afternoon immediately upon adjournment. Ah... it is solely for the purpose of permitting any member of the House to ah... make any suggestions or comments or requests of the Rules Committee ah... for changes they think will be to the benefit of the House and to the operation of the House in the General Assembly. Ah... now, any member who wants to remain should certainly do so. You don't need to schedule your appearance today or anything."



This is an opportunity to have your say and ah... we are very hopeful that ah... everybody who has any ideas will be here today for presenting them to the Rules Committee. That will be immediately upon adjournment. No votes will be taken, but all suggestions and comments and criticisms will be gratefully received."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley."

Farley: "Ah... yes, Mr. Speaker ah... Representative McPartlin, the Chairman of the Public Utilities Committee, asked me to make an announcement about the Public Utilities Committee. It will not meet at the scheduled time. So, for those that are on the Public Utilities Committee, it will not meet at 4:00 P.M.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer. Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a meeting of the Republican members of the Executive Committee tomorrow morning at 9:30 in ah... Conference Room G3 in the State Office Building."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Point of Inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I notice on the calendar that it states that the Motor Vehicle Committee is meeting tomorrow at 1:00 P.M. It was my understanding, that Committee was meeting today and is there an error on the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "As far as I know, it's set for tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess the answer is that there was an error."

Londrigan: "It's set for tomorrow at 1 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other announcements? Representative Merlo.
Merlo."

Merlo: "Ah... I had ah... received ah... a question from some of the members of the Insurance Committee as to whether or not there was going to be a meeting and the answer is 'no'. However, we will get into schedule next week, next Wednesday at 4 o'clock."



Speaker Redmond: "Any other announcements. Representative Shea, do you desire recognition?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House do now adjourn until 10 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you hold that for a moment?"

Shea: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fary desires recognition."

Fary: "Labor and Commerce will meet at 2 o'clock today in Room D1 across the street."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction and First Reading."

O'Brien: "House Bill 621, VanDuyne. a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning Jurors. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 622, Hanahan et al. A Bill for an Act in relation to the rate of pay for state employees not subject to Personnel Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 623, Hanahan et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections in relation to State Police. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 624, Hanahan et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to State Police. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Barnes, right in front."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ah... the ah... Appropriations Committee Division II will meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock in Room 118. At 2 o'clock this afternoon, Room 118."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McLendon."

McLendon: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to announce that Personnel and Pensions will meet promptly in Room 122A at 4 o'clock this afternoon. We only have two Bills on the call and if we are prompt, we can get out quickly. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Death Resolution is the order of business."

O'Brien: "House Resolution 99, Lechowicz. In memory of the right Reverend Monsignor Edward M. Burke. House Resolution 102, ah... J. Dunn et al. In respect to the memory of Mr. Robert L. Shade. House Resolution 108, Katz et al. In respect and



memory of Robert S. Fiffer."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea is recognized for the purpose of the Death Resolutions."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that we do now adopt the Death Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Moved the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Now Shea on the motion to adjourn."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that this House now stand adjourned until 10 A.M. tomorrow morning, Thursday, March 6."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been moved that the House do now stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at the hour of 10. All indicates... All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House is now adjourned."



MAR 5 1975

1,

Katz: "The meeting of the House Rule Committee will begin.

I have been designated by the Speaker and the Chairman of the Rules Committee to preside here today. We are convened for the purpose of receiving suggestions and comments from Members of the House or from the general public ah... directed towards improvement in the Rules of the House. It is a free and open hearing and anyone is free to ah... come forward. Several Members have ah... up to this point indicated that they want to testify, but there should be no reluctance on the part of any other Member or any member of the general public who is here due to the notice that has been posted for the requisite 6 1/2 days to ah... testify here and give up the benefit of the suggestions that you might have. The first witness ah.. here today is Representative James Londrigan ah... a Democrat here from Springfield. Representative Londrigan has requested the ah... opportunity to appear here before the Committee. Representative Londrigan, would you like to come forward here and testify to the ah... House Rules Committee?"

Londrigan: "Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, this 6 point program is the same program that I took to our then leader ah.. Clyde Choate the day after the election. Clyde incorporated some of these proposals into his own proposed rule changes shortly thereafter. In addition, thereto, I presented the 6 point program in Joliet when we were contesting for the Speakership. Some of these are contained in other proposals by other Members and some are not. The first proposal is one that we all are in agreement about. It is a general statement that all possible steps must be taken to avoid the last minute legislative log jam that we have experienced in the last Session. Everyone agrees with this in general principle, but the question is how. Obviously one way is to bring forward the cut-off date of Bill Introductions and Committee Considerations, but most important of all, the Speaker and the House must keep these rules and not suspend the rules at the request of individual

Members. Two: The last five days of the Session should be devoted entirely to Conference Committee Reports. A Conference Committee Report received one day should not be voted on until the following day. We all know that one of the biggest abuses in the House is the Conference Committee Report which the Majority Party shoves down everyones throat at the last minute. We hardly have them on our desks before we're asked to vote upon them. Most of the Members are not even aware of what are in these Conference Committee Reports. This is the biggest abuse in the House and one way of correcting this is to devote the last day of the Session entirely to Conference Committee Reports and there is no reason that we should vote on a Conference Committee Report when it is introduced. It should lay on the table at least one day and possibly on the last day of the Session we could suspend Conference Committee laying on the table on that day, but there is no reason to do it on any other day. So I think that it is important that these Committee Reports lay on the table for at least one day so the public as well as the Members can see what are in these reports. Third: All dates for the movement of Bill should be moved forward. I think that the Speaker has agreed on this already and it shall be done. Fourth: Legislative Commission consisting of legislators only should be abolished and the work performed by Committees and Sub-Committees. Another abuse, I think, that we have far too often is we have too many Commission Reports and expenditure of money by Commissions. The Legislative Committees, themselves have people run them who are professionals. They are a year around Committee. They are certainly more able than a Commission to bring forth productive work and we should use these Committees and Sub-Committees. Fifth: The Adjournment Resolution should provide not only the time we convene the next day, but the approximate time that we are to adjourn. All too often in the past, Members of the House have not known what our work schedule is going to be, when we are going to adjourn and what is going to be con-

MAR 5 1975

3,

ducted. I think that the Speaker when at all possible should give the Members all the information concerning adjournment and the work to be performed during the day. To continue with point five, before adjournment at a days Session the next days agenda of Bills will be called or both should be posted so that the House and the public are advised to what Bills will be considered the next day particularly important Bills. I see no reason that the House should not post Bills as we do in Committee. Certainly a day ahead of time will advise the Members and public and we will have a more orderly process the following day and on important Bills when everyone wants to be here, they will know that they will be called on that day. Sixth: Everything possible should be done to persuade the Senate to abolish Committee Proxy Voting. This is the biggest evil and abuse in the Legislature and while we ourselves, can not control it as it is the Senate proposition, we having long ago abolished Proxy Voting in the House, this abuse can be corrected and it should be immediately. We all know that Senator Partee is behind it, but I think the Speaer and each Member of the House should go to their Senator and persuade him to get rid of this abuse. This six point programs that I have put to you for the record and as I say some of them are also proposed by others and I hope that the Committee will give them some consideration, but regardless of our rules, I think that the important thing is that the Speaker and the Members of the House should abide by the rules and stop attempting to suspend them when it meets their own individual favor. Thank you."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Londrigan, you can be very sure that the Rules Committee will give attention to each of your suggestions. Ah... the next legislator who has indicated an interest in testifying is Representative John Matijevich ah... a Democate of North Chicago. I would want to say that in my ah...number of years around the House, that Representative Matijevich has been on the most

vigorous opponents of fair, orderly and open legislative proceedings and I know personally Representative Matijevich, that I will ah... look with particular interest to the suggestions that you may have to advance for improving the operations of the House."

Matijevich: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate those remarks and Mr. Chairman and Members of the Rules Committee, I quickly jotted down while I was listening to the Governor ah... some suggestions that I thought the Rules Committee ah.. might take under consideration. Ah... I have those written, ah... while Jim Londrigan was giving his presentation I added a couple of others in my mind. First of all, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Rules Committee, ah.. I would respectfully suggest that Rule 23(a) be amended to allow in each category of recommendation in the consideration of Bills. Add Sub-Section 8 to read, 'The Bill be held in Committee for further study.' My contention is that too often Bills are reported out because the Committee are under the gun ah.... under Rule 23 to recommend something or other when the better or more responsible course of action would be to further study the issue. In other words, under our present rules ah.. the Committee is almost obligated to either go up or down with legislation. Very often it will go up and not really thoroughly study the issue and I think that if we allow by the rules for the Committee to keep a Bill in Committee, ah... after all we are an annual Session and it's possible that by waiting and further study that then a good Bill could come out, rather than passing what might be bad legislation. Two: I would suggest to amending the rules so that in even number years No non-Appropriation or Non-Revenue Bills be considered unless they be introduced as Committee Sponsored Bills. We have toyed with the idea in the past that only emergency Bills be considered ah... other than non-appropriation matters in the even numbered years and that hasn't worked. It's been abused and I think that if we change that, that they be only Committee Sponsored Bills. The Senate worked with

MAR 5 1975

5.

that last year and I thought they did a good job. I think that ah... that would change the proliferation of Bills during the even number year and we could spend more time studying appropriation matters, which I think ought to be our obligation in the even numbered years. Three: After the Session adjourns, ah... hopefully on June 30th ah... in this would be an innovative idea that the House meet once a month in Prefunctorary Session, at which time Members may introduce study proposals which shall be numbered and referred to the appropriate committees. In this way the committee would be on going working committees studying issues and problems as they develop. The committees could hold public hearings on subject matter, which may lead to legislation rather than only considering specific Bills. I think that the legislature could go a long way in proving itself if it follows this procedure. Now there are two others that I jotted down when Jim was speaking and one is ah... I believe that I am one of some Members who believe that we should take some step to eliminate the Co-Sponsorship of Bills and I know that we are not going to eliminate completely Co-Sponsorship. I know that that is impractical. I am one who believes that we shouldn't have any Co-Sponsors, that we should only have single Membership Sponsorship of Bills, but I know that that is not going to get anywhere. I would hope that this Rules Committee would be working towards the future and at least adopt a Bill ah... after all it's too late.....it's almost too late to do anything because we're almost into April already, but I would hope that at least we have a Bill consider..... ah... consider a Bill that might limit the Sponsorship to ten Members. I think this would go a long way because you know when you have a Bill and you've got thirty Sponsors or fifty Sponsors on it, they really haven't studied the Bill, but their name is on it and they are on that Committee that's hearing the Bill ah... immediately you cannot be objective because your name is one that Bill and I would hope that the Rules Committee strongly considers to take the first step to try and eliminate

MAR 5 1973

6.

Co-Sponsorship of legislation. Now the last measure that I would ask that you respectfully consider, ah.. I believe that we spend too much of the taxpayers money with Congratulatory and Death Resolutions. The Senate, ah... I understand had a study that it costs \$700 per resolution. I think that Senator Cecil Partee had a good idea that we ought to change that and have a certificate of recognition, which would only cost a couple of bucks, that no Member shall spend the time of staff or ah... which we know is short right now or the staff on the Legislative Reference Bureau. It takes up so much favorable time drafting up resolutions, so I would hope that what ever you do you try and consider some way, maybe as a first step, limiting the number of resolutions per Member ah... except for Leadership possibly, but take some steps to try and eliminate the proliferation of House Resolutions. I think we waste too much of the taxpayers on that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Rules Committee."

Katz: "The next legislator that indicated that he would like to be heard today is Representative Don Deuster ah... a Republican from Mundelein ah.. who has been previsted before the Rules Committee in regard to suggestions I recall last year. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Thank you Mr. Chairman and Members of the Rules Committee. I have three suggestions. Most of us appreciate that there are times when our General Assembly looks like a carnival and a circus and all of us are sort of organizationally made to look like baboons and clowns because we go late into the evening and it's very hard, especially on the older Members. It hard on all of us. We get sleepy and we fall asleep ah... the people from Springfield come into the galleries to look at us and laugh and I think that one of the things that we could do to behave in a more orderly and dignified fashion would be to adopt a policy concerning adjournment in the evening and I've introduced House Resolution 95 which is before the Rules Committee to provide a new Section 7(a) on adjournments and it simply says 'no action may be taken by the House after

10:00 pm. on any legislative day under any order of business except announcements and Death Resolutions and any matter before the House at 10:00 pm. on any other order of business shall be continued until the same order of business on the next legislative day. Of course, all rules need an exception and ah.. there is a provision that this rule could be suspended on the affirmative vote of 107 Members. What this would do would be to put in our Rule Book a policy which we would normally try to abide by and abide with that would make us all look better and behave ah... in a more systematic and orderly fashion. We could always suspend it for the necessity of rules, but I think that this is a policy that should be in the rules. The next two suggestions are both ah... rule changes that The United States Congress has adopted to strengthen their committees. House Resolution #91 would require that all of our Committees establish standing Sub-Committees. This means that for every Committee, ah... at the beginning they would divide their Committee into subject matter jurisdiction and they would establish their two, three, four, or five Sub-Committee Chairman or however they wanted to establish. I think that it should be at least two or more. This way we would have on each Committee ah.... maybe three Sub-Committee Chairman and then there would be a Sub-Committee Minority Spokesman. This way when the Committee was confronted subjects that needed further study they would have ah.... sort of pigeon holes ah.. presently organized into which they could refer these Bills and it would be in a very orderly way and it would also inance and strenthen the power of the Committee because you could establish Sub-Committee Chairman with special experience over specific subject matter areas. The third suggestion is another one that the Congress found convenient and that is to give the Speaker and the House a little greater latitude in assigning Bills. House Resolution #92 ah... would allow the Committee on assignment of Bills to refer a Bill, any Bill to two or more Committees. Sometimes we do have Bills that overlap and a big battle

MAR 5 1975

8.

awages over which committee it will go to and if the Sponsor gets the Bill sent to a more favorable committee he has won that battle and sometimes a committee may be bypassed and sometimes there are two or three committees with similar jurisdiction. This would allow the committee on the assignment of Bills to assign one Bill two different places. They could either do that jointly or sequentially, that means one place first and then the second committee later. I think quite often we do that with Bills that require an appropriation. The appropriation goes along with the companion Bill and then where the companion Bill might come straight to the floor, the appropriation would go to the Appropriation Committee, but I think this would allow us to resolve some of these jurisdictional battles and also allow two committees with jurisdiction over ah... a subject, ah... to both hold hearings. The question would arise, what if one reports is out and the other doesn't? I think that could be resolved by having the Bill reported ah... allow it to be considered on the House floor and then the other committee would at least be in the position, having heard witnesses and ask questions to tangle with the Bill on the floor. Those are the three suggestions. They are designed to strengthen our committee structure and also to improve our appearance and our orderly functions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Deuster. The next legislator that has indicated an interest in ah.. being heard before the Rules Committee is Representative Sam Maragos, ah... a Democrat from Chicago. Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Chairman and Members of the Rules Committee, I echo some of the remarks that were made by Representative Deuster regarding the construction and formation of Sub-Committees, which would be permanent Sub-Committees of every committee. As Chairman of the Revenue Committee I have had the opportunity in the last two weeks to know that... and

MAR 5 1975

prepare items that we should be considering as a committee and that they should have permanent Sub-Committees to which these various Bills on the subject matter of concerning revenue should be addressed to and in fact in very many areas, like we are considering right now, and especially in property tax assessment, which are reports of Joint Committees and other studies, they should go, I believe, first to a Sub-Committee before the Full Committee heard them because by a Sub-Committee you can have many of the witnesses testifying you can have more time allotted to witnesses and experts in the various areas to testify and not take the time for the Whole Committee in that regard. So I would echo the remarks that the rule especially ah... 18 or 50, which are between 12 and 18 should pertain provisions where there would be permanent Sub-Committees upon the nomination of the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and a Minority Spokesman. Another area where we faced just yesterday in the Revenue Committee is when we have already set up a Sub-Committee to ah... consider various Bills in a certain substantive manner under the revenue area, we find that some of the Bills are no coming in.... for example we heard two full Bills only yesterday on the question of ah...property tax assessment, which are Sponsored by a Member of the Republican Party, ah... Mr. Skinner, and then we also know that in the hopper and he already them referred to our committee was another Bill by Representative Beaupre and I felt that even though that Bill by Beaupre had not been assigned or posted yet, that as long as it was under the control of our committee that we could assign that Bill for hearing to the Sub-Committee and therefore save the committee's time and all of the witnesses time. I would recommend very strongly that a provision be put in that as long or a Bill or a Resolution was already referred to the committee that it was under the control of the committee and even though it had not been posted as long as the other..... there are several Bills in the same category were submitted to a Sub-Committee that that Bill

MAR 5 1975

10.

should automatically go to that Sub-Committee for consideration without being fully heard by the Full Committee. Now another area which I think bears very very acute and depth study is the area of Joint Hearings between the Senate and the House Committees of the same substantive area. Again this area that has come through ... of where we have the tax assessment problems is a good case in point. These Bills that are before our Revenue Committee for instance, are the subjects and products of a hearing and study of the Joint Property Tax Committee under... ah... set up by Senate Joint Resolution #10 during the past Session ah... from the 78th General Assembly. Now if we had.... and I think that these Bills should be properly considered because they are going to be ah... again the same facts, the same issues and the same witnesses are going to testify, both in the House and in the Senate and I think it behooves that in order for the ah.... to reduce the strain and the time and the money on everyone concerned, both witnesses and Legislative Members that the Leadership have an automatic system where by which we as Members can apply to the Speaker and say to him that we feel that this article ah... or this Bill or this substantive matter has enough importance that it should be a Joint Hearing between the Senate and House Committees and thus for lock in a procedure by which we could do this and therefore expedite the hearings and in most cases.... most of those hearing should be in the evening after both Houses have adjourned and there by allowing proper witnesses and proper testimony to be taken. Those are my recommendations, Mr. Chairman and if any... in any way you want any further study on these or any further testimony I will be glad to appear again before and Sub-Committee of this Rules Committee.

Thank you."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Maragos. Your suggestions will be before the Rules Committee ah... yes, ah... Mr. Lundy?"

Lundy: "Mr. Chairman, would Representative Maragos yield for

a couple a brief questions?"

Katz: "Ah... knowing Representative Maragos, I'm very sure that he would be willing to respond, but knowing you Representative Lundy, ah... I'm not sure that they will be brief questions."

Lundy: "Sam, was it your proposal that a Bill ah... be re ah... that the rules be amended to allow a Bill to be referred to a Sub-Committee on votes of the committee even though the Bill had not been posted or would you want it to be referred at the discretion of the Chairman, without the committee even having a chance to consider the Bill?"

Maragos: "At the discretion of the Chairman once the Sub-Committee on this particular subject has been established, then.... and the Bill was already in the control... had been referred to the committee, the... then the Chairman would automatically have the right to suspend that Bill and therefore not to have to waste the time of the Sub-Committee ah... I mean of the Full Committee ah... just before that, without being posted."

Lundy: "Do you see any values to at least having the committee ah... have a right to agree or disagree to the referral? In other words, ah.. there's certainly in some cases ah... there is room for differences of opinion about whether the Bill falls within the jurisdiction of a Sub-Committee or doesn't and ah... I just wondered rather you would see any value in saying, ah... for example that a Bill could be referred to a Sub-Committee on vote of a majority of a committee even though it hadn't been posted, rather than just leaving it to the Chairman."

Maragos: "Well, we have a peculiar situation as I said yesterday that would make it difficult then, I think the committee as a whole ah... or the Whole Committee should have a right to take out or ah... overrule the action of the Chairman, but initially I don't think that the Chairman should be prevented from doing it. They should have almost complete control but ah... I gave an example yesterday with one of the Bills I mentioned ah... because of the time element and we want

to ah.... we don't want to kill these Bills, we want to bring them back for a Full Hearing within a week or so and to have them properly studied and the main thing is that a few amendments oughta be given by all of the testimony of the witnesses, therefore instead of waiting, and I did it by action ah.. with the approval of the committee, however as Chairman ah.. if I would have known about it and we could have posted it ah... we didn't have it printed up in fact, so that's why we could post it for yesterday, but the committee should have a right to overrule the Chairman at the following meeting if they felt he took it....."

Lundy: "No, if we gave the Chairman the discretion to refer to it to a committee that had already been established with jurisdiction over the subject matter of the Bill, but then require the Chairman to report to the committee that he had done so and then at that point it would be in order to move to discharge the Sub-Committee."

Maragos: "That's right. I'm thinking of the witnesses primarily who have to come to talk about it should have advanced notice on this."

Lundy: "Thank you very much. That's all I wanted to know."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Maragos and Representative Lundy. Representative Robert Downs ah... a Democrat from Oak Park ah.. asked to be able to appear briefly before the Rules Committee."

Downs: "Thank you, Chairman Katz. I recognize that experience by in large is going to dictate some of the more sophisticated rule reforms, but there are several that I did not want to see at least uncommented upon. Ah... I heard alot about rule reform prior to this Session and up until this time, but even now it appears to myself as a freshman that there is far too much suspension of the rules with regard to the notice requirement. A growing number of legislators who are maintaining service offices in their districts for instance, where this becomes especially critical. Some of us are furnishing notices of committee ah... hearings and the Bills which will be considered at that time and the

suspension of the rules, as we have seen in the past and as some of us have experienced as we came down to testify in the past is something that certainly medicates against that kind of opportunity for people to follow the process of government. I ah... would like to comment also on the particular Rule 50(a) which permits a Member who has voted 'present' to in the course of that legislative day then have themselves recorded otherwise 'yea' and 'nay' as long as that vote is not changing the result which was previously announced. Perhaps there is a reason for this switch that has not been called to may attention, but it seems to me ah... there is no justification for this other than to encourage the avoidance of a legislative responsibility with regard to the position of ourselves on a vote. If it is indeed a case of not having sufficient information to cast a particular vote at that time than the fault is in the process leading up to the vote in so far as our ability and means to so inform ourselves. I endorsed also Representative Matijevich's suggestions with regard to congratulatory resolutions and I'm sure that just an impressive document can be created through the means of a certificate and we would not tie up the time of this House and staff in preparing the resolutions as it has been currently. Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear and make these comments."

Katz: "Representative Joseph Lundy ah... a Democrat from Evanston ah.. who is also a Member of the Rules Committee and a very valuable Member of the Rules Committee ah... requested permission to be heard."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I spoke briefly to the Rules Committee last when it met in Chicago to outline in a general kind of way the ah... proposals that were made and supported by some 20 Members of the House prior to the election of the Speaker this year and in connection with the contest for the Speakership and I outlined that at that time six general objectives that ah... that those proposal sought to achieve ah... I won't try and review that

MAR 5 1975

14.

now. Let me turn my attention rather to some specific proposals that are now before the committee in the form of House Resolutions proposing to amend the House Rules. I will simply summarize each of these briefly and try to give the rationale behind the proposed change in the rules and then it might make the most sense to simply... if it's agreeable to the Chairman to ah.. simply take questions on that proposal if there are any at that point. The first one is included in House Resolution #61. House Resolution #61 proposes to amend Rule #4, which is the rule on the powers and the duties of the Speaker; to add a new paragraph which would make it a duty of the Speaker, 'to issue in co-operation with the Comptroller and after clearance with the United States Internal Revenue Service, written regulations covering administration of the contingent expense allowances of Members of the House. The reason for adding this would be that many Members have experienced difficulty in the past and have had vouchers sent back ah... have been told after they have made expenditures that they were expenditures that weren't eligible for reimbursement and by having written regulations which have been cleared in advance with the Comptroller and with I.R.S. we both save our Members a lot of extra trouble by having vouchers bounced back. We also perhaps keep them out of trouble with the Federal Government by avoiding ah... the use of contingent expense allowance money for things which it is not really usable for. We also protect the Members against ah... the charge that they may have improperly utilized some of the contingent expense money to their own benefit and therefore would be required to report it as income and pay federal tax on it. I think that this is matter of enough concern that I really don't need to say anymore about that. What we're really proposing is simply that we have some written guidelines that the Members can rely on so they know when they are on solid ground and when they're not, in terms of how they use their contingent expense allowance. House Resolution #62 proposes to extend the concept of the

special order of the day. Presently we have in our rules in Rule 11 a provision that allows the Rules Committee to adopt a resolution which set the special order of business for the day. Ah.... that allows the committee, in effect, to take a particular Bill that is especially controversial or especially news worthy and set it for debate at a particular date and hour so that the Members know when it will be coming up, know that if they care to speak on that Bill they had better be present at that time. All of that is in the present rule. House Resolution #62 would propose to extend that concept so that in addition to specifying the day and hour at which the debate would commence on any particular proposal, the Rules Committee could also set an overall time limit on debate. For example, ah.... just to take ah.... a recent example ah... if the Governor's Bonding Proposals were coming up and it was known to the Rules Committee that it was especially controversial, the committee could not only set the debate to begin at 1:00 pm. but could set the debate to terminate at 3:00 pm. The rule goes on to say that in addition to setting an overall limit on debate, the Rules Committee may provide if it chooses, that the time will be divided equally between proponents and opponents and that the time for each side will be controlled by the Sponsor of the Bill in the case of the opponents and by the ah... Senior Committee Member, ah... the Senior Member of the committee with jurisdiction over the Bill ah... who has opposed the Bill in committee for the ah... opponents. What would happen at that point would be that the since those Members control the time ah.. Members wishing to debate a particular Bill or to have a chance to debate it would come up to the Member controlling the time for his side, if he was a proponent or opponent ah... and ask if he could have an allotted time to speak and it would be up to the Member controlling the time for his side to allocate that time among his Members. Prior then to the debate commencing, the persons controlling the time would be able to give the Speaker a definite list of those Members who wish to speak on the matter

and ah... we would have some greater certainty about ah... how the debate would ah... proceed. That of course would not limit spontaneity in debate because any Member would be free at any time to yield any portion of his time to some other Member if ah... if he could be prevailed upon to do so. Another benefit of this approach, of course, is that in addition to ah... knowing when the debate begins and knowing when we ought to be present on the floor ah... in order to hear the debate if as is sometimes the case Members are called off the floor during debate by having and overall time limit on debate we would know when the vote was scheduled to take place. To go back to one of my earlier example in the case of one of the Bonding Bills if debate were scheduled to begin at 1:00 pm. and to end at 3:00 pm. then the Member would know that wherever he was he better get over to the floor by 3:00 pm. because that's when the vote would be called on that measure. I might say that House Rule 62 ah... and it's proposed addition to such order of the day is quite similar to a device which is often used in the U.S. Congress to provide greater certainty to the Members about when important Roll Call votes will be coming up. As I say, I would be glad to respond to questions on any of these as I go along if anybody has any. House Resolution #63 proposes to amend paragraph 20 ah... paragraph (f) of Rule #26. Paragraph (f) presently says, 'Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriations.' Now what the additional language proposed in House Rule #63 would do is to clarify what that present language does not mean. The present language, of course, is quoted right out of the Constitution and what House Resolution #63 would do is to add to that language, 'an Appropriation Bill is limited to the subject of appropriations not withstanding the fact that it contains one or more provisions'.... and then there are three categories that would be permitted on Appropriation Bills. One: A provision directing that some or all of the funds appropriated in that Bill for a particular purpose must be spent or obligated within a specified period of time. Second would

be a provision prohibiting the obligation or expenditure for one or more specified purposes of some of all of the funds appropriated in the Bill. And Third, would be a provision imposing requirements in connection with the obligation or expenditure of funds appropriated in that Bill even if those inquires are not otherwise imposed by law. Now the reason for trying to clarify that these three types of provision would... are permissible as ah... parts of an Appropriation Bill is to protect ah... the legislative appropriations process and to give the legislature the power that many Members believe we need over the way the Executive Branch spends appropriated funds. Let me just briefly give an example of each of kinds of provisions that would be permitted if House Res. #63 was adopted.

Number One: A provision directing that some or all of the funds appropriated in that Bill for a particular purpose must be expended within a specified time. Well, an example of that would be an attempt ah... several years ago, ah... two years ago, I believe, that originated in the Senate to require the Department of Mental Health to make available all of the grant money for community mental health centers, which the legislature appropriated. The reason for that was that we had found in prior years we would appropriate millions of dollars for programs and the department would refuse to obligate that money. The legislators felt that they ought to be telling how much of that money they wanted spent and it shouldn't be left to the discretion of the Director of the department or the Bureau of the Budget to make that determination. Under this proposal that kind of a provision would be valid.

Second, a provision prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of one or more ah... for one or more specified purposes of some or all of the funds. Well, a good example here would be the present attempt by the Executive Branch to transfer money appropriated for ah... for example, the Department of Public Aid to pay for employees who were formally employed in the Governor's Office of Human Resources.

Now whether or not we agreed with eliminating the Governor's Office of Human Resources, I think we can all agree, that the Governor ought not to be able to transfer funds from one department to wholly separate purpose. This provision would simply say that we could add to an Appropriation Bill a prohibition on extending the funds in that Bill for a specified purpose and finally the provision that would allow imposing requirements in connection with the expenditure of money not otherwise by law. An example of that is the device that the Appropriations Committee has used in recent years to require a department, for example, to make quarterly reports back to the Appropriations Committee on the rate of expenditure or the nature of expenditure of funds appropriated for certain purposes. I think that that is a valuable requirement. I think we ought to be able to do it, but given the present state of our rules I think that it is questionable whether that kind of a limitation really is valid and that's the purpose of House Resolution #63."

Katz: Ah... yes?"

Friedrich: "I would like to ask ah... if he is aware that the Attorney General has been asked for an opinion on this ah... partial veto that the Governor made with respect to this kind of language in a Bill? Mr. Rogers, over in the Attorney General's Office is presently in the business of drafting a Attorney General's opinion in connection with this particular Section of the Constitution and ah... my impression is that he is going to rule that ah... the Governor cannot strike out direct language in a Appropriation Bill if it's for a specific purpose as he did in that particular Bill."

Lundy: "No, I wasn't aware of that, Representative, but I ah..."

Friedrich: "If you'll check with Roger's ah... I think you'll find that he has gone a long way down this road that you're talking about."

Lundy: "Fine. I would only say that

opinion were to come out against us ah...the House has been known in the past to ignore Attorney General's opinions on ah... various Sections of the Constitution and so I think that it is important that we have it in our rules because if the matter ever goes to a court ah.. we shouldn't have a provision in our rule which simply repeats a provision of the Constitution. We ought to expand on that and try to make clear our own rules what we think that provision means, but I will check with Mr. Roger's to get a better clarification on that."

Friedrich: "Well, I know that he has spent considerable time going into the intent of the ah... convention and in this particular phrase ah... in fact, ironically, I was the person who presented that particular Section to the Constitutional Convention and he has kept me up a couple of nights ah... going back trying to remember what I meant, but he has ah... he is doing some work on that if you're interested in that."

Lundy: "Fine, thank you."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Friedrich."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. House Resolution also relates to the subject of appropriations and it makes ah.. a couple of ah.. I think controversial proposals in this respect. I'm glad to see that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee is present today. Ah... these again are attempts to expedite the appropriations process and also to strengthen the legislatures roll in the appropriations process. House Resolution #64, would add a new rule after Rule 26 ah..which would ah.... in fact, it would add two new rules, which would deal specifically with the subject of Appropriation Bills in Rule 26.1 and then Departmental Appropriations Bill ah... that is Appropriation Bills for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the departments and agencies of state government in Rule 26.2. In Rule 26.1 would really simply restate ah... language that is presently in Rule 26 relating to Appropriation Bills, but it was felt that it was more appropriate to put in a separate rule since the language relates only to Appropriation

Bills. The second rule ah... Rule 26.2 is the one which contains the more controversial proposal and there are a number included here. The first paragraph would say ah.. that ah... Appropriation Bills for departmental appropriation, that is for agencies and departments of state government, ah... could be drafted only the Bureau of the Budget, the department of agency involved or the Legislative Reference Bureau or by the Appropriations Committee Staff and ah... cleared with the Legislative Reference Bureau. The second part would say that the Departmental Appropriations Bill and this is quite a departure from our present procedure, could be introduced or sponsored only by Members of the Appropriations Committee or by the Committee itself with the Chairman designating a Member of the Committee to handle the Bill. This would really accomplish two things, First, it would eliminate the need for ah... a Sponsor outside the Committee who very often really isn't at all familiar with the department fiscal situation ah... who nevertheless has to come to the Committee, must handle the Bill on the floor, although he isn't terribly well informed about the nature of the departments budget and would put that function in the hands of somebody who really is prepared to handle the questions that the Members may have, namely a Members of the Appropriations Committee. Secondly, it would avoid a problem which we have on occasion run into where individual Members who are asked to Sponsor the Appropriations Bill of a given department ah... attempt, for one of the better terms, to hold the Bill hostage. That is to use it for purposes of bargaining with the Leadership of their own party or with the Governor's Office or with someone else. The theory is that that simply isn't an appropriate way to use a Departmental Appropriations Bill and that the likelihood is that it wouldn't happen if the Bill were under the control of the Member of the Appropriations Committee. Ah... third, Rule 26,2 would say that if the Appropriations Bill for any given department of agency of state government is not presented to the Chairman of the

Appropriations Committee or the Speaker within one week after the Governor submits his budget proposals, the staff of the Appropriations Committee may, itself, draft the bill, based as closely as possible on the Governor's proposals, but if they are not sufficiently a...definite to allow the drafting of the bill, then based on the prior year's appropriations bill for that Department. The thought here, is not so much to preempt the Bureau of the Budget or the Governor's ability to tell the legislature what he wants that it can make proposals, but simply to get the Appropriations process rolling so we don't have to wait weeks and sometimes like we did last year, months, before we get the bills after the Governor has submitted his budget proposal. So in effect, what the third proposal in 26, the new rule 26-2 would be that if we don't have those bills in a timely fashion after the Governor submits his budget proposal, our own Appropriations Committee staff can go forward and draft those bills, we'll start the hearings, and then, at some later point, the Bureau of the Budget comes in with the bill, it can be substituted or the bill drafted by the Committee staff can be appropriately amended to reflect the Governor's actual intention. And, finally, the last matter is a... in 26-2 is to propose that departmental appropriation's bills be handled on a schedule which is more expedited than the schedule for other bills. In other words, where we might have an April 15 cutoff date for the introduction of other bills; for departmental appropriation's bills, everyone of those bills ought to be introduced by, say, the first of April or conceivably, if we were to advance the budget's submission deadline, we could make that introduction deadline even earlier. A...likewise, the a...the deadline for Appropriations Committee action on these bills, for House action, and for consideration of Senate Appropriation's bills would also be moved up. The idea being that, hopefully, by early June we could have completed action on Appropriation's bills and a...leave the remainder of that time for other bills or for Conference Committees on Appropriations bills and so forth.

That's the substance of House Resolution 64."

"House Resolution 65 is an attempt to clarify the procedures of the House regarding veto motions. We found in the last General Assembly, that the rules were very inadequate in specifying how the House would proceed to the consideration of veto motions. A...for example, the grossest example, the rules did not even provide for the offering of the motion to concur in an amendatory veto. It only provided for a motion to override. Even though both motions under the Constitution are permissible, and since there was no way under the rules to determine which motion would have precedence, if both were filed, no way to tell who had the right to file this kind of motion, a... no way to tell whether any one other than the sponsor had a right to sponsor an override motion on any kind of a veto or a motion to restore or reduce the appropriation and so forth. The purpose of Rule 44, the new Rule 44, that is House Resolution 65, is to clarify that situation. House Resolution 66 would propose what is hoped would be a more a...efficient manner of verification of roll call votes, and I should say, at this point, that this resolution does not reflect the recommendations of the 20 or 25 members who endorsed that package of rules reform. This is my own proposal and it is derived from a procedure which is used in the U. S. House of Representatives. What it comes down to is, basically, is that rather than having the name of each member called by the Clerk and have that member a... then later verified by someone challenging his presence, the Speaker, when a verification was called for, the Speaker would appoint what would be called, Tellers, that is members of the House who would stand on either side of this main aisle of the House to check the presence in the chamber of members voting on one side or the other. As soon as those Tellers were appointed, they would be given a copy of the electronic roll call and the members on the side that was being verified, would simply be asked to walk up the center aisle between them. It is thought that that procedure would

probably consume less time than the present verification procedure, especially if we were to do away with the polling of absentees before the verification procedure. It would also, since it would require the members to get up out of their seats, make it a little less likely that we would have verification, unless the vote was really close. We've had situations in the past where verifications were called for even though there was a 20 or 30 vote difference between the prevailing and the losing side, and this probably would cut down on that. House Resolution 67, again, is the a...kind of a personally proposal. It was not included in the rules package. What it would do is to add the authority for the Speaker or his parliamentarian to keep a record of the precedence of the Speaker's rulings on various interpretations of various rules. A...really, what this is is simply to make sure that all of the members are playing by the same rules when we confront a difficult parliamentary situation. A.. so that if the Speaker has previously ruled on a rule that is difficult to interpret, all of the members would have access to that former ruling and would be able to sight it has a precedent. The rule doesn't say anything about whether the Speaker has to abide by that or not; it simply says that the Parliamentarian would keep a record which would be available to all the members of how the Speaker had ruled in interpreting various provisions of the House rules. A... House Resolution 68 is an attempt to get at the problem of excessive bill loads of the House committee's. A...what it would do is to set up a procedure for initial screening by committees of those bills that are referred to the committee, and give the committee, without the presence of public witnesses, but only with the attendance of the chief sponsor, a...an opportunity to decide whether it wanted to set a particular bill for public hearing prior to the expiration of that session of the General Assembly, or put it over until a later date. In effect, you would have a kind of mini-meeting of the committee at the beginning of each day's session, the Chairman would give each member a

list of the bills referred to the committee, and the members, ...and a synopsis, and the members would then decide...do we want to set this bill for hearing before June 30, or do we want to put it over to the fall? The chief sponsor would be able to be there to make a pitch as to why the bill was important. And I should point out that this procedure would only apply to bills that were introduced after a specified date, such as March 15, or March 21st, some dates...a...late enough that it would give members who didn't want to take a chance of having their bill put over, the opportunity to introduce it early enough to avoid this procedure...a...but the procedure itself, would then give the committee a chance to review its own agenda periodically, and decide for itself what it wanted to sit and hear and what it wanted to put off until later. I think the value of this could be enormous in April or May when we get to a situation where some committees have on their agenda upwards of 200 bills that they have not yet been able to set for hearing, the committee could make, at that early point, a determination that, maybe, half of those bills simply weren't important enough to be heard before the expiration of the session in June and could put them over for hearing at a later date. House Resolution 70 would propose a place of limitation on a member's right to explain his vote. What it would do is to say that, and its a very mild limitation, I think other members have spoken strongly about greater restrictions, but all that House Resolution 70 proposes that if a member has spoken in debate on a question, he may not explain his vote unless he is the chief sponsor of the bill. House Resolution 71 is part of the rules package and its a proposed reform in the bill assignment procedure. What it would say is that a...well, there are really two parts to it. One is that it would direct the House Parliamentarian to develop a written statement of committee jurisdictions. So that for each standing committee of the House, there would be written up and submitted to the Rules Committee, and if

approved by the Rules Committee, then include it as an appendix to the rule, a written statement of the jurisdiction of each committee. The bill assignment function would then be transferred back to the Speaker who in turn, could delegate it to the Parliamentarian if he wished, with the idea, that since the committee jurisdiction's are spelled out in the rules, the referral of bills ought to be a fairly perfunctory matter. However, if it turns out not to be, excuse me, and there is a dispute about the proper reference of the bill the committee, a...the proposed House Resolution 71 would give the individual member the right to appeal the referral of the bill to the floor. He could explain a... a...the committee to which the bill was referred, explain to which committee he thought it could have been referred, and why, relying on the statement of committee jurisdiction, and if he can convince a member of the majority of the House that he is right, then he would be entitled to have his bill referred to the committee he preferred, rather than the one to which the Speaker had referred it. A...House Resolution 72 proposes to make one, I think fairly minor change in the committee as a whole procedure. At the present time, under Rule 31, a..the Speaker has absolute discretion as to which bills to refer to the committee as a whole. Under this proposed resolution, it would be open for any member to submit a motion to the House proposing that a particular bill be submitted to the committee as a whole and if the majority of the elected members supported the motion, that bill would also have to be referred to the committee, to the a... committee as a whole. A...this I think, has special application when you have a number of bills on a given subject, and perhaps the Speaker only sees fit to see one of them...those bills, to the committee as a whole, this would permit members who are sponsoring similar bills to also seek to have their bills referred to the committee as a whole at the same time. A...finally, Mr. Chairman, House Resolution 90 would amend Rule 73 to impose some fairly stringent requirements on motions to suspend the rules. The

reason for this, I think, has been pointed out by earlier witnesses before the committee, and that is that when a member can simply rise on the floor, and on the spur of the moment, can propose the suspension of a rule, it simply happens too often, and also too often not enough members know actually what is being voted on, so House Resolution 90 would propose to amend Rule 73 to require that before a motion to suspend a House rule or a joint rule could be considered, the motion would have to be in writing, be printed and distributed to the members' desks. Secondly, it would have to identify the rule or rules to be suspended. Third it would have to state the bill or resolution or the subject with which, with respect to which the rule was being suspended. And fourth, it would have to face the justification for the rule suspension. That is, why it was impossible to do whatever the maker of the motion proposes to do in accordance with the rules. A...and finally, that motion, as one other member has proposed here today, would have to be on the calendar for one legislative day before it was in order to consider it. I suggest that this is quite a radical departure from our present procedure, but I think it is one that would benefit the proceedings of the House and certainly would cut down on the numerous attempts to suspend the rules that we experience now. It wouldn't preclude it, it would still permit a member in a appropriate case to do it, but it would give the members better information as to what was being considered when the motion is made and it would certainly make the sponsors think more carefully and work a little more before they made such a motion. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that's all I have and I would be glad to respond to any questions, if there are some from the members of the committee or others."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Lundy. A...we have a...three other members who have indicated an interest in being heard briefly. First Representative John E. Porter, Republican from Evanston. Representative Porter, my distinguished young colleague from the 1st District."

Porter: "Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I was listening with great interest to the previous witness' suggestions for rules change, and I find in my mind, each one of them was well taken, and I would urge you to a... adopt them. I think Representative Lundy has really laid a very good ground work for a number of changes in the rules. I had one small suggestion of my own that I had not planned to present to this committee, but I would like to just briefly. A....last session, I had a bill that would have exempted pension income from the Illinois income tax for the year 1971. It appeared that the pension income from 1972 onward, had been exempted by the General Assembly a....by a....law, and that 1969 and 1970 had been exempted by court rule, that this one year was open. And the bill was passed by the House and sent over to the Senate and, unfortunately, died in the Senate Revenue Committee. It is again being introduced there, this year, and hopefully, will pass. I think it is an example of the type of thing that often happens to legislative bodies where, through oversight, certain provisions are not included that were intended to be included in the entire body of the law. Last week in the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, a....we were a...considering a bill mandating a particular program to be taught in the schools and I think on the committee sitting there said 'My God, look at the list of all these mandated programs that we have requiring the teaching of everything from honesty to integrity to bicycle safety, etc....why hasn't somebody reformed this section of the law and taken out some of the superfluous material'. I think that if I look back on the 14 years that I've practised law, the growth in our statutes has been probably between two and three times as large as they were 14 years ago. I think that a specific committee that has the function of making our legislation consistent and also has the function of removing from our laws all of the various obsolete provisions that seem to continue in them year after year, would be a wise step for the General Assembly, and for this House. I think a committee on legislative oversight would

.....with just one staff member working, maybe, on a part time basis, a...could do wonders to clear up a lot of the extra material that should have been removed from the statutes and make the various sections consistent with one another. A...I think that this a a...suggestion that has been adopted by a number of legislative bodies throughout the country. I think that the U. S. Congress has such a committee. And I think that it is one that would allay the fears of many of our own constituents who believe that we do nothing down here, but continue to add, year after year, to the very overwhelming volume of the law. So I would suggest that the Rules Committee consider the creation of a specific committee on legislative oversites and that they address themselves to that, I think a very real problem. There are two other matters that I wanted to mention while I'm here. One is, and I have no specific suggestions, in these areas, but I think they are important. One is that the procedure with Conference Committee Reports, which all of you who are in the 78th General Assembly, will remember, a...with a...a great deal of adversity at the time, ought to be reformed, so that it works in the way that it was originally intended and cannot be abused. In the last closing days of a very hectic session. And I think, also, that we, you, you the members of the committee, ought to address yourselves to some sort of a penalty for extending beyond the June 30th day, the legislative session. A... I don't know what form that penalty might take, I know that it requires, of course, a 3/5's majority instead of the normal constitutional majority to pass a bill at that time, but I think there ought to be some further penalty worked out in some way to make sure that we do close down our legislative business by a day certain. A...last June, about the 20th day, I had prepared by the Reference Bureau, a bill that would have provided for a forfeiture of leadership pay if we weren't out of here by June 30th, and I did that only, not wholly, facetiously, I think that there ought to be some sort of penalty provided for not terminating our legislative session at June 30th. Those are the suggestions

I have and I appreciate your time in hearing them."

Katz: "Yes, a question from Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "On your late suggestion, a...I noticed that the bill that you had drafted last year was facetious, but what would you think of a proposal to send the payment of per diem to the members after June 30th? It seems to me the leadership, frankly, you can't blame all of the delay on the leadership, and I think the leadership is responsive to the members, and I can't imagine any greater pressure being generated on the leadership than simply cutting off the per diem allowance. "

Porter: "I think that, Joe, is a very good suggestion. Something similar to that that comes right to the members need to terminate. What ever kind of pressure is a reasonable one I think that would be, I don't know how well that would be received, but I think that that would be a very good suggestion."

Katz: "Yes, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "In response to this suggestion on the committee on legislative oversight, it was my impression, maybe this has been changed, since I've been away a little while, but that the Legislative Reference Bureau used to prepare a number of bills which were presented and were almost automatically adopted near the end of the session to clean up the statute and do the thing I think you proposed to do by another committee. Now the Legislative Council and the Legislative Reference Bureau are both employed by the arms of the legislature, and I wonder what you would do with this committee that they are not already doing?"

Porter: "A...Dwight, I don't think what the Reference Bureau and the Council do is what I have in mind. They recodify the sections and put things into their proper place within the statute. I'm thinking of addressing ourselves substantively at matters that would never get considered, but that as we go through the committee hearings, we find them in the body of our law, and we all say to ourselves, 'My God, how did that get there, why is that still on our books, and shouldn't we do something about it,' and then we all forget about it

all forget about it and go on to the next order of business. They don't address themselves to that, to my knowledge, at all."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Porter. The next ...the next witness a....who, I'm sorry, yes, Representative Porter, Representative Lechowicz, whom I was about to call on to testify was signalling and I thought it was to indicate he was ready to testify. Apparently, he desires to ask the witness a question."

Lechowicz: "A..thank you Mr. Chairman. Representative Porter, you mentioned the fact that last year there was a delay in having the session come to a close on June 30th. And you are proposing a change that the persons would not, as Representative Lundy pointed out, that would not be receiving their per diem. But what provision do you have as far as the administration? What penalties are there for the administration? If they are the ones that are really the true culprits in extending the legislative process?"

Porter: "Well, Ted, I didn't come here with a, as you know, I didn't come here with a specific suggestion, I merely wanted to say that that is one matter that the Rules Committee ought to address itself to."

Lechowicz: "Did you review last year's reason why last year was extended to over June 30th?"

Porter: "Sure."

Lechowicz: "And what was the cause of that?"

Porter: "Well, there was a number of causes. I agree that the administration was probably involved also. But I think that if we have pressure put, we can't put pressure very well on the administration. We can put pressure on ourselves. And I think if we put pressure on ourselves, it works to the advantage of clearing up the problem just as well as it would be to put pressure on some one else. If we are not here to act, things are going to get accomplished ahead of time instead of at the last minute."

Lechowicz: "I just wanted to point out the fact that it was the administration and the Attorney General, if you remember, that really caused the problem."

Porter: "Well, depending on how you look at it Ted."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Porter. The next witness is the distinguished Chairman of the House Appropriation's Committee, Representative Ted Lechowicz, of Chicago. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you very much Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules Committee. I would hope that you would take the comments as they are given and in complete sincerity and I would hope that you would address yourself to a very serious situation in providing for the first time, as long as I've been a member of this General Assembly, the possibility of the availability of having joint rules both in the House and the Senate to work with. That, in my opinion, is probably one of the top priorities of this Rules Committee so we can have a functionable form to work within. A number of items I'd like to bring for your consideration today dealing with the elimination of duplicate bills, both either in the House or the Senate. And we all know the cost of the introduction of a bill in time and in money, and I would hope that the Rules Committee would make it part of the joint rules in the elimination, especially the elimination of duplicate appropriation bills. Let me give you an example, and what I'm referring to, normally, a department will introduce an appropriation bill here in the House, and an identical appropriation bill in the Senate, and that is a duplication in time and effort and in evaluation of the proposal. What they should do is introduce the measure and provide the staff with the proper facts and figures as they are requested, the evaluation based upon our, as best, our judgement in the passage of from one House to another to the input of both chambers. I would hope that all duplicate bills, even in this session, would be eliminated. Today, we received a message from the Governor asking for an appropriation of approximately 11 billion dollars in State money. I would hope that, in the future, when the Governor, whoever the Governor may be, would present his budget message, that we, the members of the House and the Senate, would receive a fiscal note based upon the Bureau of the Budget, the

Economic Statistical Commission and possibly, the Revenue Committees of both Houses in giving us the fiscal note as they see it in the next coming year. We are asking our membership to review a budget and, in turn, we don't know if we have the dollar amount available to us. I would also ask that the Rules Committee take into consideration that there be a deadline, an absolute deadline, for the administration to introduce their appropriation measures. I've been a cosponsor of that bill, now, for four years. And both administrations are hesitant in having that measure passed into law. I would hope that the Rules Committee will address themselves and state that if the budget message is given the first ~~in~~ in March, you and I know that the necessary data to compile that budget message is completed, and I would ask that the Reference Bureau have all the necessary bills completed within a month's period so the first week in April, all budget items would be submitted for review, whether in the House or in the Senate, and in turn, would give the staff the proper amount of time to evaluate and come up with a schedule, an agenda, for public hearing, and their input as well. We mentioned the fact that an agenda is in order, and I think this agenda is in order and the operation of the House, when we come in order, and the committee structure as well. And I believe that the Rules Committee address themselves, stating that at 9 o'clock we go into session, and if a member is not here by 9:15, he is considered tardy, and in my personal opinion, should be docked for the day. It may be a little bit stringent, but I think in order to make sure that we have maximum a...a... representation here on the floor, and when the Speaker calls for the House to be in order at 9 o'clock, and many members come in later than that, that this will no longer be tolerated. And I would hope that that also will be considered. Now if a member has a bill in another committee, that it is to be understood as far as committee agenda is concerned, I think in all fairness that the members of the committee should address the Chairman and a co-chairman, whatever the case may be, in providing them with information where they can be reached.

I'd like to also ask that the a prepared agenda be prepared for the House action on the floor, so that a member can know approximately what time his bills will be called and what order of business will be on at a given time. I want to compliment the improvements that we have made so far but I think we've got a ways to go. One is as far as the committee structures and the staffs, I believe, since the Chairman is responsible for the action of the committee and its staff, that a person should be hired based upon qualification, he can be reviewed by the Speaker's staff, with the final determination being made between the Speaker's staff and the Chairman of the respective committee as far as the hiring of personnel and also the compensation of the people that are working with in the respective committee.

Committee notification as far as the posting of bills should be addressed to the respective member, and in turn, if the member asked for a continuance of two different times, it should be up to the perogative of the committee chairman to post a hearing on that bill so we can procede with the orderly advancement of bills within this chamber. Many times that committee bills are held and people think that they are being held for another reason, and they are actually being held at the request of the sponsor. I'm a firm believer that if the committee is functioning and a bill is posted, notification is given, we are asking for participation from people from within government and outside of government, that when a bill is posted, it should be heard. I think that if we have an agenda, we can prepare our agenda in an adequate amount of time so we can have staff handlezation of the bills, active committee participation, and that is posted when it should be heard. We've talked about the legal, I'm sorry, Legislative Reference Bureau. I would hope that all bills would have to have the stamp of the Legislative Reference Bureau no matter where they are drafted so in turn, they could be incorporated within their computer system on the introduction to the Speaker or the Clerk. Representative Lundy pointed out a very important item that I think has been lacking that is as far as the protection of

the members, as a whole, and the people that are employed by them on their voucher expense in reference to a guide line from the Comptroller's office and we received a brief outline of expenditures last year, that I think it has to be more detailed. I would hope that we would consider the fact that if a person is employed on the voucher system, that he be a State employee who, in turn, to protect the member and that individual for withholding taxes and also for having that person participate in the social security and retirement benefits from the State. All I can state as far as, if you want to have this thing move a long, we have our bills introduced by a certain date. Especially, the reference of appropriation matters, elimination of duplicate appropriation bills, and in turn, come up with a very strict agenda on the hearing and the passage stage. I think that this would be brought into the rules of the House that we would be out of here by the 15th as far as the actions and then we can go into a conference committee for a week. Conference committee action for one week and in turn, ask the membership to come back as a whole the last week and be through with the orderly business of the House. There was some comment in reference to delays with last year and the years prior to that. Unfortunately the delay or cause is not a one-sided effect, whether you can't receive the information from the agency, or the information that you receive and you compare it with other sources is not accurate, and I would be more than happy to extend the conference committee, but you can't be in session and having conference committees meeting at the same time. Its a physical impossibility. So that I would hope that the bills would be out of committee action, be ready to pass on Third Reading in both Houses, but as the middle of June, you set up a week for conference committee, agendas and reports and in the last week, for final action. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would be more than happy to answer any questions that you have."

Katz: "Thank you very much, Representative Lechowicz. If there

are no questions of the witness, the witness's suggestions will be a...taken by the Rules Committee and given every consideration. Representative Webber Borchers, a Republican for Decatur is the next witness who has indicated an interest in being heard by the Rules Committee. Representative Webber Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, a...

Representative Lechowicz and Representative Lundy both have touched upon a matter that I want to bring more fully to the attention of the committee. I think some should be done about in this committee. I am going to read not the whole editorial, but certain sections of it in the Decatur Herald and Review, the title of it is Oversight for Legislatures. Now this study of our system was made by the editorial staff of the Lindsay-Straub Newspapers, a...concerning the handling of vouchers and our expense account."

Katz: "Excuse me, Representative Borchers, I would be very happy to receive that editorial in evidence and it would appear in the record in its entirety."

Borchers: "I'm not going to read it all, just pertinent points, if that's all right with the Chairman."

Katz: "Well, I don't know what length you plan to read it, I was just going to suggest that it can be incorporated..."

Borchers: "I'm going to give it to you, I had already predetermined to do that. But I think that some of the meat of the editorial a... a...which is....a ...from a study is appropo to this committee."

Katz: "Well, you do understand that I'm so impressed with the newspaper that I was going to place the entire editorial in the transcript."

Borchers: "You are going to get it. But I do want to bring out a couple of points because I wish to amplify on them. Is that all right?"

Katz: Yes, you may proceed."

Borchers: "Very well. Many Illinois legislators are puzzled these days. I'm only going to hit the high spots on this, because you can read yourselves between the lines. You are all legislatures, you know what you are doing. Their concern

is legitimate but they seem unable to get answers from any one in Springfield concerning the handling of the account and their fear is justified. It is not easy on the basis of these court cases for the legislature to figure out how to use the voucher expense allotment fairly and conveniently. Again, I'm jumping considerable material. For them, it may seem inconvenience or irritating to access a separate office, a separate employees in your home or here or wherever you may be, and I'm jumping again. But that runs the risk of violatin some federal or State laws which you might not even know about. There is also a delicate line to walk ethically. How many people have been hired? These are questions that the paper is now asking. How many people have been hired? What are they being paid? Are they actually working? How many are full time employees? And there are some of the major points of the editorial. The legislature should review its programs and provide mechanisms for oversite of House is working as well as working and correcting the abuses it might find. A committee should be designated that can tell a legislator whether a specific use of his expense money he has in mind is consistend with ethics and the law. That's all of the article I'm going to read then I'll turn this over to the Chairman, but I do want to make some additional comments. When a freshman legislator comes in and has a certain amount of money to use, he really doesn't know what is right and what is wrong. For example, it ways on the a..a...bill form, amongst other things, not hiring uncles and aunts and brothers and so on, which we all know about, but he should be using this money for what you consider your duties and your responsibilities. Well, what is your duty and your responsibility? under certain conditions? This is where this Rules Committee could come into effect. You could present the problem and say does this fall within my duties and responsibilities? Now what does research and technical mean? I personally, I feel I fell a foul unjustly, but I fell a foul because I didn't know from my point of view or the membership

what technical means? What can I do under technical? I simply don't know and neither does the editorial staff of the Decatur Herald and Review. So I think we should define more truly the meaning of research and technical. Secretarial is easy enough, but that technical can cover a multitude of sins or it is a tremendous help for a legislator who is trying to do something in responsibility and what he considers his duties and his responsibilities. Now, a... in relation to looking back, in relation to our employee, I agree with what has been suggested here, and I think we should do something about this in relation to social security numbers, a...withholding taxes, withholding security taxes, a..having regular State employees, I think it would save us a tremendous a lot of trouble, and again, if there is any question, referring back to some committee from the Rules Committee, a subcommittee of the Rules Committee who handles this specific point. And this specific responsibility. Now we have three divisions of government, I don't need to explain it. The Executive, the Legislative, the Judicial, we all know these things, a few basics, but I feel that as long as a member of the legislature who is honestly using his money for what he thinks is right, we should protect each other, the Senate and ourselves, in that fact that I don't believe that there is a single one of us here, to tell the Governor, the Executive Branch, how they should work their internal affairs, their internal bookkeeping for the money we give them, that's their business. The Judicial is the same way. We can't tell them what to do. We have no right over their budget and how they handle these things. We give them the money and that's it. So it seems to me that if a member of the judiciary and a member of the investigating branch of the judiciary, wishes to have an employee, for example, who is going to investigate drug users, that that is their responsibility and we have no right to question that on the same basis as long as no member of the legislature fraudently or perverts or uses the money or perverts the money to his own user, I don't believe they have a right to tell us what to do. I think

this committee, that I would like to suggest perhaps by resolution, further resolution, and its logical under your committee to come under your responsibility of a committee, I think when something like this comes up it is the responsibility of this committee representing the House, to make a decision and support a member in what he's trying to do as long as it is an honest decision for the best interest of the people and it is within his legislative duties and responsibilities. So the key would be let it fall within the legislative responsibility and duty of a legislator. And there, you can make up that decision. So I would like to, in finishing and closing, I would earnestly request for the future, that and particularly, for freshman who do not know the background of the rules, they come with exuberance to try to do something. I feel that this committee should have a subcommittee whose sole function but one of the sole function of the subcommittee, would be to make decisions when requested and a...develop the rules that all of us know exactly what they are. Because by this study, made by a well known newspaper, there is no doubt in my mind that there are no real rules and regulations for us to follow. And you can innocently get yourself in one hell of a jam. Although you mean well and your intent is well. So I'll turn this over and I do hope you will listen to what my suggestion, and I think I shall, if the Chairman of this committee suggests, put in a resolution giving or suggesting that this group committee do have a subcommittee to go into this matter."

Katz: "Thank you Representative Borchers. Your suggestion will appear in the transcript. The transcript will be available to all of the members of the Rules Committee, it will not be necessary to file a separate resolution. That's up to you as to whether you desire to do so, but the suggestion will be duly before the Rules Committee as a result of your testimony here today. Are there any other members of the a... yes, a....the a....Reverend Deacon Davis. Yes, would you do so, Deacon, I would a....feel that the, actually that the transcript was not complete without having had an oral

statement from you."

Davis: "Mr. Chairman, and members, I believe that once we adopt the joint rules that many of these proposals which have been submitted here, a...perhaps will be taken care of. I just want to enlarge on something that Representative Londrigan said, and that is a...one of the most undemocratic practices that any legislative body can participate in is the type of proxy voting that is practiced in the Senate. Its death, and when I say death, I mean death, its death to minority legislation. It has been death to my bills. I'm joined with a bill now that I backed in this House three times. Only when it reaches the Senate, Mr. Chairman, I think I've got it out of committee and the Chairman goes in his pocket and he has a good supply of signs, not made out, but just signs and blanks, proxies, and when he brings those signs blank proxies out of his pocket, you are dead. You are right back where you started. A...I cannot urge this House any more sincerely than I'm trying to urge now, let's get on with adopted some joint rules and then seeing if we can't prevail upon the Senate to stop the undemocratic practices of committee chairman carrying a pocket full of proxies. This is ruled by one man and that's the Chairman of a Senate committee. He has more power than the Speaker of the House or the President Pro-Tem of the Senate has."

Katz: "Thank you very much Representative Davis. Is there any other member of the House or any other member of the general public who would like to testify here today? There being no further response, the public hearing held by the House Rules Committee on March 5, 1975, will be shortly coming to an end. I did want to say to all of you who appeared here today and to those who appeared at the public hearing in Chicago, that the Speaker is deeply appreciative of the interest that has been shown. He is most appreciative of the suggestions that have been made. And wants to assure the members who have participated here, that those considerations will be duly presented and considered by the House Rules Committee. There being nothing further to come before the House, the meeting of the Rules Committee is hereby adjourned."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND LEGISLATIVE DAY

MARCH 5, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 5, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 5, 1975

| TIME | SPEAKER | DESCRIPTION |
|-------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| 9:50 | Speaker Redmond | Come to order |
| 9:51 | Speaker Redmond | Doorkeeper |
| 9:51 | Doorkeeper | |
| 9:51 | Krueger | Prayer |
| 9:54 | Speaker Redmond | Roll Call |
| 9:55 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 9:55 | Hart | State Tournament |
| 9:56 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 9:56 | Cunningham | Lawrenceville Indians |
| 9:57 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 9:57 | Hart | |
| 9:57 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 9:57 | Cunningham | |
| 9:58 | Speaker Redmond | Quorum Presents |
| 9:58 | Speaker Redmond | House Bills, Second Reading |
| 9:58 | Speaker Redmond | HB 20 |
| 9:58 | Jack O'Brien | HB 20, One Amendment, Second Reading |
| 9:59 | Speaker Redmond | Out of Record |
| 9:59 | Speaker Redmond | HB 37 |
| 9:59 | Jack O'Brien | |
| 9:59 | Speaker Redmond | Out of Record |
| 10:00 | Speaker Redmond | HB 47 ...Out of Record |
| 10:00 | Speaker Redmond | HB 50...Out of Record |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

| | | |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| 10:00 | Jack O'Brien | HB 84 |
| 10:00 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:00 | Jack O'Brien | HB 84 |
| 10:00 | Speaker Redmond | Go to Third Reading |
| 10:00 | Speaker Redmond | Out of Record |
| 10:00 | Jack O'Brien | |
| 10:00 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:00 | Speaker Redmond | HB 98 |
| 10:01 | Jack O'Brien | HB 98, Second Reading |
| 10:01 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:01 | Simms | Moved to adopt |
| 10:01 | Speaker Redmond | Amendment Adopted |
| 10:01 | Speaker Redmond | Any further Amendments |
| 10:01 | Jack O'Brien | Amendment #2 |
| 10:01 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:01 | Shea | Move to adopt Describe Amendment |
| 10:02 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:02 | Schlickman | Yield to question? |
| 10:02 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:02 | Shea | HB 98...Answer to Question |
| 10:03 | Schlickman | Discussion |
| 10:03 | Shea | |
| 10:03 | Schlickman | |
| 10:03 | Shea | |
| 10:04 | Schlickman | |
| 10:04 | Speaker Redmond | |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| 10:04 | Friedrich | |
| 10:04 | Speaker Redmond | Further discussion |
| 10:04 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:04 | Schlickman | No copy of Amendment |
| 10:05 | Speaker Redmond | Out of record |
| 10:05 | Speaker Redmond | HB 116 |
| 10:05 | Jack O'Brien | HB 116...Out of Record |
| 10:05 | Speaker Redmond | HB 186 |
| 10:05 | Jack O'Brien | HB 186...Out of Record |
| 10:06 | Speaker Redmond | HB 218 |
| 10:06 | Jack O'Brien | HB 218...Second Reading |
| 10:06 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:06 | Jack O'Brien | Read Amendment #1 |
| 10:06 | Speaker Redmond | Amendment Distributed |
| 10:06 | Speaker Redmond | HB 218..Recognition of Representative |
| 10:06 | Speaker Redmond | HB 218..Explanation of Bill |
| 10:07 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:07 | Schlickman | Question |
| 10:07 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:07 | Schlickman | Discussion |
| 10:07 | Shea | |
| 10:07 | Schlickman | |
| 10:07 | Shea | |
| 10:07 | Schlickman | |
| 10:08 | Shea | |
| 10:08 | Schlickman | |
| 10:08 | Shea | |
| 10:08 | Schlickman | |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| 10:08 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:08 | Shea | Move to adopt Amendment |
| 10:08 | Speaker Redmond | Amendment adopted |
| 10:08 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:08 | Walsh | Discussion |
| 10:08 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:08 | Shea | |
| 10:08 | Walsh | HB 218 |
| 10:08 | Shea | |
| 10:08 | Speaker Redmond | HB 263 |
| 10:09 | Speaker Redmond | HB 263 |
| 10:09 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:09 | Jack O'Brien | Second Reading |
| 10:09 | Speaker Redmond | Any Amendments? |
| 10:09 | Speaker Redmond | HB 278 |
| 10:09 | Jack O'Brien | HB 278 |
| 10:09 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:09 | Peters | Offer Amendment #1 |
| 10:10 | Speaker Redmond | Clerk, read Bill first |
| 10:10 | Jack O'Brien | Second Reading, HB 278 |
| 10:10 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:10 | Peters | Explain Bill and Amendment |
| 10:11 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:11 | Schlickman | Discussion, no copy of Amendment |
| 10:11 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:12 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:12 | Dunn | No copy of Amendment |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 10:12 | Speaker Redmond | HB 278 |
| 10:12 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:12 | Geo-Karis | No Amendment |
| 10:13 | Speaker Redmond | Pages report to Clerk |
| 10:13 | Speaker Redmond | No Page on Floor |
| 10:13 | Speaker Redmond | What good would it do? |
| 10:14 | Speaker Redmond | Out of Record |
| 10:14 | Speaker Redmond | HB 295 |
| 10:14 | Jack O'Brien | HB 295..Second Reading no Committee Amendments |
| 10:14 | Speaker Redmond | Go to Third Reading |
| 10:14 | Speaker Redmond | HB 307 |
| 10:14 | Jack O'Brien | HB 307..Second Reading |
| 10:15 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:15 | McMasters | Ask Sponsor to hold |
| 10:15 | Speaker Redmond | Pleasure of Sponsor |
| 10:15 | Friedland | Discussion..Amendment |
| 10:15 | McMasters | |
| 10:16 | Friedland | |
| 10:16 | Speaker Redmond | Hold on Second Reading |
| 10:16 | Speaker Redmond | HB 313, any Amendments? |
| 10:16 | Speaker Redmond | Hold on Second Reading |
| 10:16 | Speaker Redmond | HB 335 |
| 10:16 | Speaker Redmond | HB 352 |
| 10:16 | Jack O'Brien | HB 352, Second Reading of Bill |
| 10:16 | Speaker Redmond | HB 352, go to Third Reading |
| 10:17 | Speaker Redmond | HB 371 |
| 10:17 | Jack O'Brien | HB 371, Second Reading of Bill |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 10:17 | Speaker Redmond | Go to Third Reading, HB 371 |
| 10:17 | Speaker Redmond | HB 420 |
| 10:17 | Speaker Redmond | HB 420 |
| 10:17 | Jack O'Brien | HB 420, Second Reading |
| 10:17 | Speaker Redmond | Go to Third Reading |
| 10:17 | Speaker Redmond | HB 116 |
| 10:17 | Jack O'Brien | HB 116..First Reading |
| 10:18 | Speaker Redmond | HB 116 |
| 10:18 | Jack O'Brien | |
| 10:18 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:18 | Jack O'Brien | Amendment read |
| 10:18 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:18 | Satterwaite | Discussion..Amendment |
| 10:19 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:19 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:19 | Schlickman | No copy of Amendment |
| 10:19 | Speaker Redmond | HB 116..Do Members have copies? |
| 10:20 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:20 | Speaker Redmond | Hold on Second Reading |
| 10:20 | Speaker Redmond | HB 117 |
| 10:20 | Jack O'Brien | HB 117, Second Reading No Committee Amendments |
| 10:20 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:20 | Jack O'Brien | Read Amendment |
| 10:20 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:20 | Satterthwaite | Explains Amendment |
| 10:21 | Speaker Redmond | Vote to adopt...Passed |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|--|
| 10:21 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20, Hold on Second Reading |
| 10:22 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37 |
| 10:22 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 37, Second Reading, 2 Amendments |
| 10:23 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:23 | Brinkmeier | Relating Bill |
| 10:23 | Speaker Redmond | Amendment #1, Motion passed |
| 10:24 | Jack O'Brien | Amendment #2 |
| 10:24 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:24 | Brinkmeier | Move to adopt #2 Amendment |
| 10:24 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:24 | Schlickman | No copy of Amendment |
| 10:24 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37, Discussion on distribution of Bills and Amendment |
| 10:24 | Fredericks | House Bill 37, Discussion |
| 10:25 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37 |
| 10:25 | Hoffman | House Bill 37, Question of Sponsor |
| 10:25 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37, He will yield |
| 10:25 | Hoffman | House Bill 37, Question |
| 10:25 | Brinkmeier | House Bill 37, Discussion |
| 10:26 | Hoffman | House Bill 37, Discussion |
| 10:26 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37, Amendment distributed |
| 10:27 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:27 | Schlickman | House Bill 37, Now has copy |
| 10:28 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 37, Motion to adopt Amendment #2, Passed |
| 10:28 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 47, Hold on Second Reading |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|--|
| 10:28 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 50, Hold on Second Reading |
| 10:29 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:29 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:29 | Ryan | Pages up-to-date |
| 10:29 | Speaker Redmond | Distribution of Amendments |
| 10:30 | Speaker Redmond | House Bills, Third Reading |
| 10:30 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 97 |
| 10:30 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 97, Third Reading of Bill |
| 10:31 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 97, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:31 | Fleck | House Bill 97, Explain Bill |
| 10:32 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 97, Roll Call vote |
| 10:32 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 97, Recognition of Representative (no answer) |
| 10:33 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 97, Take Record |
| 10:34 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 97, Bill passed |
| 10:34 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, Third Readings of Senate Bills |
| 10:34 | Jack O'Brien | Senate Bill 34, Third Reading of Bill |
| 10:34 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:34 | Brandt | Senate Bill 34, Explain Bill |
| 10:35 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:35 | Totten | Senate Bill 34, Question |
| 10:35 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, He will |
| 10:35 | Totten | Senate Bill 34, Question asked |
| 10:35 | Brandt | Senate Bill 34, Answer and discussion |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 10:36 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34 |
| 10:36 | Totten | Senate Bill 34, Discussion |
| 10:36 | Brandt | Senate Bill 34, Discussion |
| 10:37 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, Vote |
| 10:37 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, Vote |
| 10:38 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, All voted? |
| 10:38 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill 34, Bill passed |
| 10:38 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Bill, Senate Bills First Reading |
| 10:38 | Jack O'Brien | Senate Bill 85, First Reading |
| 10:39 | Speaker Redmond | Second Reading |
| 10:39 | Speaker Redmond | Committee on assignments |
| 10:39 | Speaker Redmond | Introduction of First Reading |
| 10:39 | Jack O'Brien | First Reading of Bills |
| 10:43 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:43 | Fary | Rules discussion |
| 10:44 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:44 | Geo-Karis | Question |
| 10:44 | Speaker Redmond | Yield |
| 10:44 | Geo-Karis | Postponment of Bill discussion |
| 10:44 | Fary | Postponment of Bill discussion |
| 10:45 | Geo-Karis | Postponment of Bill discussion |
| 10:45 | Fary | Postponment of Bill discussion |
| 10:46 | Geo-Karis | Postponment of Bill discussion |
| 10:46 | Fary | Postponment of Bill discussion |
| 10:46 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:46 | Walsh | Discussion |
| 10:47 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 10:47 | Fary | Discussion |
| 10:48 | Walsh | Discussion |
| 10:48 | Fary | Discussion |
| 10:49 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:49 | Geo-Karis | Discussion |
| 10:49 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:49 | Fary | Discussion |
| 10:50 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 10:50 | Fary | Postpone Bills |
| 10:50 | Speaker Redmond | Remove motion |
| 10:51 | Fary | |
| 10:51 | Speaker Redmond | House Joint Resolution 10 |
| 10:51 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 10:51 | Brinkmeier | Explain Resolution |
| 10:52 | Speaker Redmond | Resolution adopted |
| 10:52 | Speaker Redmond | Senate Joint Resolution 11, Resolution adopted |
| 10:53 | Speaker Redmond | Resolutions |
| 10:53 | Jack O'Brien | Reading of Resolutions |
| 10:53 | Speaker Redmond | Committee on assignment of Bills |
| 10:54 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20, Second Reading |
| 10:54 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 20, Give Second Reading one Amendment |
| 10:54 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:54 | Deuster | House Bill 20 |
| 10:54 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 20 |
| 10:54 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20 |
| 10:54 | Deuster | House Bill 20 |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

| | | |
|-------|-----------------|--|
| 10:54 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 20, Read one Committee Amendment |
| 10:55 | Deuster | House Bill 20, Explain and move to adopt Amendment #1 |
| 10:56 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20 |
| 10:56 | Deuster | House Bill 20 |
| 10:56 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20, Move to adopt |
| 10:56 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:56 | Lundy | House Bill 20, Question |
| 10:56 | Deuster | House Bill 20, Discussion |
| 10:57 | Lundy | House Bill 20, Discussion |
| 10:57 | Deuster | House Bill 20, Discussion |
| 10:57 | Lundy | House Bill 20, Discussion |
| 10:57 | Deuster | House Bill 20, Discussion |
| 10:57 | Lundy | House Bill 20 |
| 10:57 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 20, Vote - Amendment adopted |
| 10:58 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 47 |
| 10:58 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 47, Second Reading, one Committee Amendment |
| 10:58 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 47, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:58 | Grotberg | House Bill 47, Discussion |
| 10:59 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 47, Recognition of Representative |
| 10:59 | Schlickman | House Bill 47, Question |
| 10:59 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 47, Yield |
| 10:59 | Schlickman | House Bill 47, Ask question |
| 10:59 | Grotberg | House Bill 47, Answer |
| 11:00 | Schlickman | House Bill 47, Discussion |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 11:00 | Grotberg | House Bill 47, Discussion |
| 11:00 | Schlickman | House Bill 47, Discussion |
| 11:00 | Grotberg | House Bill 47, Discussion |
| 11:01 | Schlickman | House Bill 47, Discussion |
| 11:01 | Grotberg | House Bill 47, Discussion |
| 11:01 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 47, Amendment adopted |
| 11:01 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 50 |
| 11:01 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 50, Second Reading, one Amendment |
| 11:01 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 50, Recognition of Representative |
| 11:01 | Grotberg | House Bill 50, Explain Amendment |
| 11:02 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 50, Recognition of Representative |
| 11:02 | Yourell | House Bill 50, Question |
| 11:04 | Grotberg | House Bill 50, Answer |
| 11:04 | Yourell | House Bill 50 |
| 11:04 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 50, Amendment adopted |
| 11:04 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 91 |
| 11:04 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 91, Second Reading |
| 11:05 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 11:05 | Deuster | Hold on Second Reading |
| 11:05 | Speaker Redmond | Hold on Second Reading |
| 11:05 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98 |
| 11:05 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 98 |
| 11:05 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98, Hold on Second Reading |
| 11:05 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 116 |
| 11:06 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 116, Second Reading no Amendments |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 11:06 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 116 |
| 11:06 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 116, Read Amendment #1 |
| 11:06 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 116, Recognition of Representative |
| 11:06 | Satterthwaite | House Bill 116, Explain Amendment |
| 11:07 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 11:07 | Satterthwaite | Move to adopt |
| 11:07 | Speaker Redmond | Amendment adopted |
| 11:07 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 186 |
| 11:07 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 186 |
| 11:07 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 186, Hold on Second Reading |
| 11:07 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 190, Hold on Second Reading |
| 11:07 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 218, Fiscal Note attached |
| 11:08 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 218, Third Reading |
| 11:08 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 218 |
| 11:08 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 313 |
| 11:08 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 313, Second Reading |
| 11:09 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 313 |
| 11:09 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 313, Reading Amendment one |
| 11:09 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 11:09 | Fleck | Move to adopt |
| 11:09 | Speaker Redmond | Amendment adopted |
| 11:09 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 335 |
| 11:10 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 335, Second Reading, one Amendment |
| 11:10 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 335, Recognition of Representative |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 11:10 | Keller | House Bill 335, Explain Amendment |
| 11:10 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 335, Discussion, Amendment distribution |
| 11:11 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 335, Amendment adopted |
| 11:11 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 353 |
| 11:11 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 353, Second Reading, one Amendment |
| 11:12 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 353, Recognition of Representative |
| 11:12 | Byers | House Bill 353, Moved to adopt |
| 11:12 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 353, Amendment adopted |
| 11:12 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 11:13 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 278 |
| 11:13 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 278, Second Reading one Amendment |
| 11:13 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 278, Recognition of Representative |
| 11:13 | Jaffe | House Bill 278, Explain Amendment |
| 11:14 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 278, Amendment adopted |
| 11:14 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98 |
| 11:14 | Jack O'Brien | House Bill 98, Amendment #2 |
| 11:15 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98, Recognition of |
| 11:15 | Shea | House Bill 98, Move to adopt Amendment |
| 11:15 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98 |
| 11:15 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98, Recognition of Representative |
| 11:15 | Skinner | House Bill 98, Discussion |
| 11:15 | Shea | House Bill 98, Discussion |
| 11:15 | Skinner | House Bill 98, Discussion |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 11:15 | Shea | House Bill 98, Discussion |
| 11:16 | Skinner | House Bill 98, Discussion |
| 11:16 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98, Discussion |
| 11:16 | Speaker Redmond | House Bill 98, Amendment adopted |
| 11:16 | Speaker Redmond | Message from Senate |
| 11:16 | Jack O'Brien | Read message |
| 11:17 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 11:18 | Speaker Redmond | Announcement |
| 11:19 | McPartlin | Announcement |
| 11:19 | Speaker Redmond | 1/2 hour lunch |
| 11:19 | Speaker Redmond | Lunch break |
| 11:19 | Speaker Redmond | Introduction, First Reading |
| 11:19 | Jack O'Brien | Reading, First Reading |
| 11:26 | Fred Selcke? | (no identification) Resolution, First Readings of House Joint Resolutions |
| 11:49 | Speaker Redmond | Joint Session Convene 12:00 |
| 11:53 | Speaker Redmond | Don't get shut out |
| 12:03 | Speaker Redmond | Joint Session come to order |
| 12:03 | Jack O'Brien | Quorum present |
| 12:03 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 12:03 | President* | Quorum present |
| 12:04 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 12:04 | Jack O'Brien | #3, Read Joint Resolution |
| 12:04 | Speaker Redmond | |
| 12:04 | Shea | Moved to adopt |
| 12:04 | Speaker Redmond | Vote, Resolution adopted |
| 12:04 | Speaker Redmond | Committee to escort Governor |

*President of Senate?



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|---|
| 12:05 | Speaker Redmond | Mrs. Walker present |
| 12:08 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Doorman |
| 12:08 | Doorman | Governor arrived |
| 12:08 | Speaker Redmond | Admit Governor Walker |
| 12:08 | Speaker Redmond | Present Governor Walker |
| 12:09 | Governor Walker | Address Joint Session and Budget Presentation |
| 12:31 | Speaker Redmond | Escort Governor from Chambers |
| 12:31 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:32 | Partee | Move to arise |
| 12:33 | Speaker Redmond | Joint Session arise |
| 12:34 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:34 | Geo-Karis | Ask what time in Session |
| 12:34 | Speaker Redmond | Session at 10:00 A.M. |
| 12:36 | Speaker Redmond | Committee Reports |
| 12:36 | Jack O'Brien | Gives Reports |
| 12:37 | Speaker Redmond | Agreed Resolutions |
| 12:37 | Jack O'Brien | #111, Reads Resolutions |
| 12:38 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:38 | Speaker Redmond | Agreed Resolution #111 |
| 12:38 | Giorgi | Agreed Resolution #111, Moved to adopt |
| 12:38 | Speaker Redmond | Resolution adopted |
| 12:39 | Speaker Redmond | Announcement |
| 12:39 | Lechowicz | Makes announcement |
| 12:39 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:39 | Katz | Announcement |
| 12:40 | Speaker Redmond | Reco |



| | | |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| 12:40 | Farley | Announcement |
| 12:41 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:41 | Lauer | Announcement |
| 12:41 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:41 | Hirschfeld | Inquiry |
| 12:41 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:42 | Londrigan | Announcement |
| 12:42 | Speaker Redmond | Error |
| 12:42 | Londrigan | Corrected 1:00 announcement |
| 12:42 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:42 | Merlo | Announcement |
| 12:42 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:42 | Shea | Move to adjourn |
| 12:43 | Speaker Redmond | Hold motion on adjournment |
| 12:43 | Fary | Announcement |
| 12:43 | Speaker Redmond | Introduction of First Reading |
| 12:43 | Jack O'Brien | Reading First Readings |
| 12:44 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:44 | Barnes | Announcement |
| 12:44 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |
| 12:44 | McLendon | Announcement |
| 12:45 | Speaker Redmond | Death Resolution |
| 12:45 | Jack O'Brien | #102 Reading Resolution |
| 12:45 | Speaker Redmond | #102 Reading Resolution |
| 12:45 | Shea | #102 Moved to adopt |
| 12:45 | Speaker Redmond | #102 Resolution adopted |
| 12:46 | Speaker Redmond | Recognition of Representative |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

| | | |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 12:46 | Shea | Move to adjourn |
| 12:46 | Speaker Redmond | Adjourned |
| 13:10 | Chairman Katz | |
| 13:11 | Londrigan | Proxy Voting |
| 13:18 | Chairman (Katz) | |
| 13:19 | Matijeovich | |
| 13:25 | | |
| 13:25 | Deuster | |
| 13:30 | Chairman Katz | |
| 13:31 | Maragos | |
| 13:36 | Chairman Katz | |
| 13:36 | Lundy | |
| 13:36 | Chairman Katz | |
| 13:36 | Lundy | |
| 13:37 | Maragos | |
| 13:37 | Lundy | |
| 13:38 | Maragos | |
| 13:38 | Lundy | |
| 13:39 | Maragos | |
| 13:39 | Lundy | |
| 13:39 | Chairman Katz | |
| 13:39 | Downs | |
| 13:42 | Chairman Katz | |
| 13:43 | Lundy | House Resolutions |
| 13:54 | Katz | |
| 13:54 | Rriedrich | |
| 13:55 | Lundy | |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

| | |
|-------|---------------|
| 13:55 | Friedrich |
| 13:55 | Lundy |
| 13:55 | Friedrich |
| 13:56 | Lundy |
| 13:56 | Chairman Katz |
| 13:56 | Lundy |
| 14:13 | Katz |
| 14:14 | Porter |
| 14:19 | Katz |
| 14:19 | Lundy |
| 14:20 | Porter |
| 14:20 | Katz |
| 14:20 | Friedrich |
| 14:21 | Porter |
| 14:22 | Katz |
| 14:22 | Lechowicz |
| 14:23 | Porter |
| 14:23 | Lechowicz |
| 14:23 | Porter |
| 14:23 | Lechowicz |
| 14:23 | Porter |
| 14:23 | Lechowicz |
| 14:24 | Porter |
| 14:24 | Katz |
| 14:24 | Lechowicz |
| 14:35 | Katz |
| 14:35 | Borchers |



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

14:36 Katz
14:36 Borchers
14:36 Katz
14:37 Borchers
14:37 Katz
14:37 Borchers
14:37 Katz
14:37 Borchers
14:44 Katz
14:45 C. Davis
14:47 Katz
14:48

Adjourned

