

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NINETIETH LEGISLATIVE DAY

JUNE 17, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Goast, Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. B. J. Bramble writes in the poem 'Detachment' O Lord, I am blown by the wind like a dry leaf scurrying around another corner sometimes lifted up and carried afar, other times ground and afoot. Yet so detached, I still long for the trees. Let us pray for a sympathetic and loyal service. O God the Father of the foresaken, the help of the weak, the supplier of the needy who have diffused in proportion Thy gifts of body and soul in such sort that all may acknowledge and perform the joyous duty of mutual service, who teach us that love towards the race of men is the bond of perfectness and the imitation of Thy blessed self. Open our eyes and touch our hearts that we may see and do both for this State, the nation and the world and for that which is to come the things which belong to our people. Strengthen us in the work we have undertaken as legislators. Give us counsel and wisdom and perseverance in taste and feel and in Thine own good time and according to Thy will, thankfulness for Thine unspeakable mercies and love to Thine dadorable Son, Christ Jesus who is He in the Father and the Son and the Holy Goast ever livith one God world without end. Amen. Mr. Speaker, The Springfield Lions Club wishes to thank you for your interest in securing the House Resolution honoring the 1974 and 1975 term of Illinois' Johnny Valvo as international president of the world's largest service organization. Please accept this certificate of appreciation from us on behalf of the over one million world-wide members of the International Association of Lions Clubs."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you very much, Father, I happen to belong to the Bensonville Lions Club. I'm not the world's greatest member,



but...will the Journal show that Representative Walsh has arrived, he's taking his place....Roll Call for attendance. Committee Reports."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Leon from the Committee on Banks and Savings and Loan Associations, reported the following Committee Bill, House Bill 3115, and recommended that it do pass. Mr. Leon from the Committee on Banks and Savings and Loan reported the following Committee Bill, House Bill 3116, and recommended that it do pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction - First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3115. Banks and Savings and Loan Associations Committee. A Bill for an Act in relation to the residential mortgages and foreclosures of such mortgages. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3116. Banks and Savings and Loan Associations Committee. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to judgements and decrees and the manner of enforcing them by execution provides for the redemption of real estate sold under execution or decree. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 4. Senate Bill 354. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 598. A Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 630. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the acquisition, control, maintenance and improvement and protection of State parks and nature preserves. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 717. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 799. A Bill for an Act relating to the exchange of real estate between the State of Illinois and the Department of Conservation and Commonwealth Edison Company in connection with Goose Lake, Prairie State Park, Grundy County. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 857. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1092. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act codifying the duties of the Department of Mental



JUN 17 1975

3.

Health. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Constitutional Amendments. Second Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #34. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the 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 add Section 25 to Article I of the Constitution, to add the added Section to read as follows: 'Article I. Bill of Rights. Section 25. Right of Privacy. The right of the people to privacy is recognized and shall not be infringed. The General Assembly shall implement this Section. Second Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "No Amendments from the floor. Third Reading. Order of Concurrence. On the order of Concurrence appears House Bill 216. Is Representative Palmer on the floor? 372. Is Representative Hirschfeld on the floor? 504. Representative D'Arco or Palmer. 582. Representative Yourell. This is final passage. He doesn't appear to be here. 600. Representative Grotberg. Take that out of the record. 650. Representative Grotberg, pardon me. You are so tiny, I didn't see you."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...a...we're on the order of Concurrence?"

Speaker Redmond: "Concurrence, right."

Grotberg: "I would move that on House Bill 600 that the House do not concur with Senate Amendment #...whatever it is...and that it be sent back to the Senate and asked that they recede from."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House non-concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 600. Those in favor vote aye. Those opposed vote no. I guess we can have a voice vote on a non-concurrence. Those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The



eyes have it. The House non-concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 600, 650, Representative Stubblefield. Take that out of the record. House Bill 658, Representative Griesheimer. Take that out of the record. 674, Representative Tipword. Take that out of the record. Is Representative Matijevich here? On 676? 714, Representative Craig? 727, Representative Yourell? Take that out of the record. 729, Representative Daniels?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 729 was a Bill that previously passed this House 111 to 28. It passed the Senate yesterday 54 to 2, and in the Senate there were four Amendments placed on it. The first Amendment deals with counties of over 200,000 and classify shall be excluded from the open-space definition. The second Amendments deals with area used primarily for residential facilities shall be excluded from open-space category. The third Amendment is that tax exempt units that purchase open-space property shall not have to pay the three year roll back. And the fourth Amendment adds to the definition of open-space. I think all four Amendments are good, all four strengthen the Bill and I would move that we concur in Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3, and #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Lee can you tell me what the new definition on open-space is?"

Daniels: "Basically its the same definition that we had before only that it says that the property must be used exclusively for open-space. Previously it said 'must be used primarily'. But the definition is the same as it was before but now it has to be used exclusively for that purpose instead of primarily."

Schneider: "Alright, now you've added a couple of exemptions so what are we left with now? For open-space used exclusively and then what are excluded. We've knocked out a few items on the Amendment."

Daniels: "Well we still have the same basic definition of open-space that was contained in the original Senate....House Bill 729.... areas that consist of ten acres or more and with the Amendment, with the areas that are not used for residential purposes and that are dedicated primarily to the maintenance of open-space areas



JUN 17 1975

5.

contained in the definition of the Bill. The definition is basically the same."

Daniels: "A...it seems to be a better Bill now."

Schneider: "A...it seems to be a better Bill now."

Daniels: "I think its a lot better...I...I concur with the Amendment and would move for that Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur with Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3, and #4...Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, could I ask a couple of questions about the...each of the Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "A...House...the...could you explain the Amendments again? There was one of them that caught my attention."

Daniels: "Well the first Amendment deals with excluding counties of over 200,000 it classifies. The second..."

Speaker Redmond: "You have to get permission, Mr. Surbala..."

Daniels: "The second Amendment deals that areas that are used primarily for real estate...for residents will not be included in the open-space definition. This was meant to exclude residential facilities containing ten acres or more and the third area is the roll-back provision. When the property is purchased by a unit of government tax exempt, that they will not have to pay the roll back provisions that are contained in the Bill, the three year roll back. And the fourth Amendment is, as I explained to Representative Schneider, dealing with the definition of open-space. Now it must be used exclusively for that purpose instead of primarily."

Skinner: "What would the difference be between exclusively and primarily?"

Daniels: "Well I think that its one that would go to, you know, a matter of symatics, I think one of the concerns of the Senate sponsors, Senator Nimrod, was that the area was used primarily that it may not have a full area that had to be used exclusively for the open space. I think that's why he put the word exclusive in there."

Skinner: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd agree with the sponsor that these Amendments make it, or Amendments #2, #3 and #4 make this a better Bill than House Bill 729 as it passed the House. But the Bill still has an awful lot of loopholes. What it does do is allow for property tax, preferential treatment for... a...open space land, but the definition of open-space land is...is still loose, the uses for which open space land can be used are still not tight enough and the public interest is involved, I don't think is strong enough. The direction in which these Bills are going around the country is to make it much tighter. There's been a Bill that's been adopted just in the last couple of weeks is being discussed in...in...a....a..New York, which says that it has a ten year provision, which is what we were talking about earlier in this Bill, but which is not contained in House Bill 729, and it also gives the public units of government first turn down if the property is going to be sold and I think that as the Bill is now, we should still vote against it. It wasn't good enough for the Cook County assessor to want Cook County to be involved in the Bill and this is one of the exemptions of Amendment #1, it takes Cook County out of the Bill and I think that if the Bill isn't good enough for Cook County, its not good enough for the rest of the State and I'd urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Yes Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Body that this Bill passed by a rather unanimous decision here in the House the first time, 111 to 28 and 54 to 2 yesterday in the Senate. I think that the basic reason for putting in the Amendment #1 is because it was felt that those counties that classify over 200,000 and I would correct the previous speaker in telling him that we did not exclude just Cook, we excluded any county that passes a county ordinance for classifying because it was felt that they would be accomplishing the main purpose that we are going after in this Bill right now. To set a uniform rate for an open-space definition. I would solicit your concurrence vote in the Amendments #1, #2, #3, and #4 in the Senate and remind you of the debate that took place



JUN 17 1975

7.

when this Bill passed the House. I think its a good Bill, its a needed Bill to retain open-space areas and it certainly is a step in the right direction and I would encourage your aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3, and #4 to House Bill 729. The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3, and #4 to House Bill 729, those in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115...119 ayes, 6 no, and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3, and #4, to House Bill 729. 730. Is Representative Greisheimer on the floor? House Bill 730 on Concurrence. Representative Griesheimer?"

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 730...a...the...a.. Mr. Speaker, you'd better pull this out of the record because I wasn't even aware of this Amendment on this in the Senate..."

Speaker Redmond: "Alright, we'll take this out of the record. House Bill 759. Representative Schraeder. Is Representative Schraeder on the floor? Take that out of the record. House Bill 773, Representative Molloy. Take that out of the record. 787, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate... a...number one...Amendment #1 to House Bill 787 really improves the Bill. It puts a floor under the population figure, a floor of 100,000. We're talking about open-space land that can be purchased. I think any county under 100,000 probably doesn't have this problem. I do move to concur for the Senate Amendment to House Bill 787."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 787. All those in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 ayes, 2 nay, the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 372, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, are you ready? Alright,...a...thank you."



Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Senate Amendment to House Bill 372 did nothing more than...a...instead of repealing a paragraph of the statute in question, amended the paragraph. It passed the Senate 46 to nothing, I have no objections and I would move we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 372."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld, did you move? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 372? All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 aye, no nay, and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 372. 650. Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill...a...House Amendment #1 to House Bill 650 was an agreed Amendment that brought the Bill into acceptable form for both labor and management. Senate Amendment #2 in effect repealed or deletes House Amendment #1. With that Amendment there is some opposition from both labor and management and I think that would break faith with myself, as sponsor of the Bill, to put House Amendment #1 on. And for those reasons I would move non-concurrence with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House non-concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 650. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it and the House non-concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 650. 658, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 658 merely clarifies the basic Bill with regard to allowing students who are enrolled in special...a...special classes in high school, participating in federally funded projects for work experience. The Amendment in the Senate changed the hours that the children could work to conform with the federal guidelines...a...we did not do this in the House and I would move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 730. Those in favor vote aye. Opposed... 658...those in favor vote aye, opposed, no...vote no. Have all



voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104...5 ayes, no nays and the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 658. 674, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is...a... amended to conform with the wishes of the downstate policemen and firemen and I move for the concurrence with 674."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 674? Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "What does the Amendment do?"

Tipsword: "Pardon me?"

Kane: "What does the Amendment do?"

Tipsword: "It..it..a..a...says that all of the local units of government under this and a...shall have no opportunity...or shall not change or alter the pension rights under the pension plan."

Kane: "Is it limited just to home rule units?"

Tipsword: "No."

Kane: "Because the Amendment sounds like it deletes unit of local government and inserts in lieu thereof home rule unit. So does this Amendment..."

Tipsword: "It takes it back to the original situation in the House, that's right."

Kane: "So the Bill now is limited only to home rule units?"

Tipsword: "No, its not limited to only to them, but it...a...no, it provides that no local unit of government can change those pension rights."

Kane: "As I read it, it applies only to home rule units."

Tipsword: "Well then that's the way you read it....I'm just telling you what it does."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Kane? Any further discussion or questions? Representative D. J. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Yes...a...the Bill, as amended, now in the Senate, is this a prohibition on the powers of home rule unit insofar as changing



the pension rights under the plan, yes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 60...674. All those in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Representative Shea."

Shea: "I'm sorry, would the sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Shea: "Mr. Tipword, when the Bill left here we said that a unit of local government that adopted the plan could not modify the plan, is that right?"

Tipword: "That's the way it was when it left here, the Senate put back in the home rule unit."

Shea: "That home rule language?"

Tipword: "Yes it did."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 674. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? What's your pleasure, Representative Tipword? Do you suppose we ought to take it out of the record and have everybody discuss it? Take this one out of the record. 676. Representative Matijevich. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, on the concurrence for House Bill 674, you took it out of the record. It seems to us that it ought to be put on Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "That might have been alright if I hadn't of called the next one, but having called it I think it is too late."

Walsh: "Well you can change your mind, Mr. Speaker, you've done it before, I'm afraid you'll do it again."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm like Gib...I'm like Gibraltar."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the ...has he read 676 yet? Have you read it? Alright. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House on the House Bill 676, the Bill relates to the sale of alcoholic liquors at State parks. When it left the House the sale was from the hours between ten..twelve noon and ten...a...12:00 P.M. It is now changed by Senate Amendment from



12:00 noon until 10:00 P.M. Also Senate Amendment #1 clarifies where the party catered shall be at least ten persons. I move for the concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 676."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann, do you desire recognition?"

Mann: "Yeh, I wondered if I might ask Representative Matijevich a question or two."

Matijevich: "Yes."

Mann: "A...do they serve liquor at all now at...at State Parks, John?"

Matijevich: "Right, it has to be with meals and it is between the hours of 12:00 o'clock noon and 10:00 P.M. This Senate Amendment doesn't change that. It...the reason for the Bill Representative Mann, was that there occasions when there are seminars and so forth where there are catered parties and the Bill would allow them to sell alcoholic liquor in conjunction with those catered parties, for example, before the party and after the party, at set-up type of bars. As you know, otherwise they had to do it sitting down. The Bill now would provide for that, but you have to have a party of at least ten."

Mann: "What are the requirements for licensure? Do you have to have a liquor license?"

Matijevich: "They evidently have licenses right now, I imagine, because they are allowed to sell alcoholic beverages right now."

Mann: "But I mean is this each park licensed in a local community or what? How does that work?"

Matijevich: "I'm not sure about that, Representative Mann, but they are allowed as I know for example at the Illinois Beach in my area and...a...I'm not sure about Marquette, but...there are State parks, State lodges where they are allowed the sale of alcoholic liquors. I'm not sure about the licenses."

Mann: "I just wondered because a Member has suddenly developed a profound interest in licensing of liquor, wine and beer, and I just wondered about it. Its a good Amendment, I'll support it."

Matijevich: "Thank you, Representative Mann."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative...any further questions? The question is does the House concur in Senate



Amendment #1 to House Bill 676. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 aye, 7 nay, and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 676. 727, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #1 to...a...Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 727 is, as I understand it, an Amendment that was suggested by the Pension Laws Committee in order to clarify the language. It provides that an application within three months requirement imposed by the Act does not preclude the participation of a policeman in the pension system of the State of Illinois and I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 727."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 727. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 ayes, no nays, and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 727. 582, same sponsor. Representative Yourell, did you get away from me? 582."

Yourell: "A...thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 582 is an Amendment that was suggested by Senator Ozinga in Judiciary Committee in order to clarify the Trust Section of the Torns Act and I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 582."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is does the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 582. All in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 ayes, no nays, and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 582. 730. 730, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry about the problem, but this Bill before, the reason that this is coming up on concurrence is that the Amendments placed on it by the Senate was identical to the Amendment placed on this Bill in the House, but Enrolling



and Engrossing did not pick up the House Amendment so that the basic Bill went over to the Senate and they had to reamend it to get the Bill in shape as it was when it was originally voted on here in the House. All this does is that it changes the increase in payable interest rates on bonds being sold by public water district from six to eight percent, and I would urge concurrence with the Senate's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 730. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 117 aye, no nay, and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 730. 759. There's an imposter on the floor, Mr. Doorkeeper...Mr. Doorkeeper? Turn around, imposter. Representative Clyde, do you desire plebons suit to get that back from Representa...."

Choate: "...salt and pepper."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Are my eyes playing tricks on me or is there a twin brother there for Clyde Choate?"

Speaker Redmond: "759. You changed your mind? 504, Representative D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 changes the status of the Bill from single family residents to make it applicable to five units and I will concur in this Amendment and hope the House will concur in it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment...Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "This...a...I have a question for the sponsor.

Representative D'Arco, the Bill as it left the House applied only to single family units and now it applies to what?"

D'Arco: "Five units or less."

Leinenweber: "A...what was the reason for the Amendment, do you know?"

D'Arco: "A...to make...a...contractors who do remodeling work more responsive to the people who rent apartments."



Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, on the ...the..the Amendment. This is...it left the House, it wasn't a good Bill...a...its coming back now, its worse because of the Amendment. The Bill is essentially unfair to subcontractors, it requires a needless exercise of additional notices to the owner of a...of a building when it...the idea was a single family person was somewhat...a.. naive and I guess it got through the House because of that and now the Senate has amended it to put five units or less and I would suggest that an owner of a apartment building of five units or less is not in the same category as the individual who perhaps has some remodeling done in his House. Again, this is probably... the last chance to beat this before it goes to the Governor so I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions or discussion? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question?"

D'Arco: "Yes."

Madison: "Representative D'Arco, this Senate Amendment, is this not the exact same Amendment that was attempted to be placed on this Bill in the House?"

D'Arco: "A...I think the Amendment that was attempted to be placed in the House applied to ten units or less."

Madison: "It was ten units or less?"

D'Arco: "Right."

Madison: "That Amendment was defeated, right?"

D'Arco: "That's right."

Madison: "Is there anything that would have us believe that five units or less would be more palatable?"

D'Arco: "I would hope so."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Grotberg. The question is does the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 504. All in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Representative Greiman. Representative Greiman?"



Greiman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very quickly to explain my vote. I think that the five units represent a very small...a...piece of real estate. Very often it's owned by the same kind of unsophisticated montah...a...a..situation you find in a single family dwelling and we have a different kind of dynamics....well, where there's a building violation going and often there's great pressure on small apartment building owners to correct building violations. Very often some very scrupulous people push small apartment owners into making these corrections and they end up paying double...well, I'm not doing much good... they end up paying...a....double, once to the general contractor and then they finally again have to pay to the subcontractor. I think this is a good Bill, I thought it was a good Bill when it left the House and it remains a good Bill. I recommend it to you."

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

Palmer: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a good Bill. What we're trying to do is give the homeowner or the owner of an apartment building of five units or less a chance to...so that he in all equity and fairness would not have to pay twice on a job that is performed where you have a defaulting contractor that goes off to Florida or Acapulco or some place like that. I think we are in an age of consumerism and I believe that it should be to the benefit of many people in this state who have been stuck with this kind of a situation. This is a good Bill, its a forward looking Bill, it does not place that much more...a... chores on a subcontractor so that he could, would be cheated out of his money or defeated in not being paid for the work that he has done. It provides for notice, it provides for the things that are necessary in order to give that little homeowner some protection so that when you go back to your districts and the people asked you what did you do for the people perhaps you can tell them about this. And tell them that you...that you've done something for them. Sometimes we get involved in many issues down here of dramatic import but sometimes we forget about these little things that we can do for people that makes their lives better economically and...a..



the people that we know about are the people that give us the votes and that send us down here to do a job for them and I think this is a good Bill, a step in the right direction and let's vote yes on this Bill and give...give at least the homeowner a little break."

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

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Judiciary I Committee of the House spent a good deal of time with this Bill and with similar Bills directed towards the same goal that this Bill was directed toward. And we substantially supported this particular concept. What's involved here is really a balancing of the equities as between the small contractor and the small homeowner. And we felt in our judgement that based on the experience in this field that something should be done in the direction of protecting the small single unit home owner. This is a meager step in the right direction. I do not feel at all that it jeopardizes the small contractor. It simply means that he may have to fill out another form or two, but when you compare that with the dishonestness and the jeopardy to the small home owner I simply don't feel that its a great burden. I think its a good Bill, its in the right direction, its a meager step, but we've simply got to do something to protect individual owners from unscrupulous operators who do not predominate the field, but there are far too many of them out there and I solicit your support for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 aye, 53 no, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 504. House Bill 2238. Representative Jane Barnes. Take that out of the record. Representative Meyers, for what purpose do you rise? House Bills' Third Reading. On House Bills' Third Reading... wait...pardon me, Committee Reports. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'd like to make an inquiry. When can we reasonably expect the Journals of May 23rd. Before we go home, I'd like to know what the record says we did on May 23rd. That's been a



month ago. Now surely we don't have that much of a printing problem, I'd like to know what it says I did that day."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll find out and let you know, Representative Friedrichs. We did have a terrible problem with the journal..."

Friedrich: "Yeh, I know, we've had journals since then, but we haven't got that one on May 23rd and I can't figure out why its being held up."

Speaker Redmond: "Thank you for calling it to my attention. I'll check into it. Committee Reports."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Maragos for the Committee on Revenue to which was referred House Bill 3012, reported same back with the substitute therefore being House Bill 3117, recommended the original Bill lie on the table and the substitute Bill do pass. Mr. DiPrima from the Committee on Veterans Affairs Registration and Regulation to which House Bill 2725 was referred, reported same back pursuant to Rule 23(d), the Bill was ordered tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Introductions, First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3117. Committee on Revenue. A Bill for an Act in relation to township and multitownship assessors. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills' Third Reading. On House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 3035."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3035. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the sponsor? Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all this Bill does is put the cities in...a...counties of over 150,000 people in the same category of those under as regards a municipality or an area of 7500 people or more incorporating. And it corrects something that happened in the statutes last session when Representative Juckett sponsored a Bill that effected ten counties up to 150,000, but not those above. And all this does is put the counties of over 150,000 on a...in the same status under the current statute. I'd appreciate your favorable support. I know of no opposition to the Bill. It was voted out of Committee



unanimously and was improperly reported and for that reason became a Committee Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "One question for the sponsor. Representative Calvo, I know you want to make the law consistent, is there a demand, an individual situation that this is designed to meet?"

Calvo: "Yes, as a matter of fact there was. There is a community in my district of about 11,000 people that want to incorporate either as a village or city and have not been able to do so because they are right next to a present municipality that is said 'well, under the current statutes, you have to have our consent'. And it simply changed it for the counties under 150,000, I think it only fair that we change it for the others."

Leinenweber: "This would be in the nature of promoting the incorporation of separate municipalities then, wouldn't it?"

Calvo: "Yes, that's correct, if they're over 7500 people."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to rise also in support of this Bill and of course I'd appreciate along with Representative Calvo a aye vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the sponsor yield?"

Calvo: "Surely."

Schlickman: "Is your Bill accurately described in the synopsis?"

Calvo: "Well I was just looking for that when I got up. Just a second."

Schlickman: "Page 2052. Volume II, 2052."

Calvo: "Yeh, I'm getting there. Indirectly, yes, in other words, its kind of worded to me backwards, Gene, but what my Bill says that if an area has more than 7500 people inhabitants, it need not get the consent of the adjacent municipality even though the county exceeds 150,000. Now we have that provision, as you know, for all counties under 150,000 which we just put in two years ago. So I'm just putting it in to be the same category. In other words, if the municipality has over 7500, they can incorporate. Indirectly



of course, if they did not have 7500, I suppose they would have to have consent."

Schlickman: "There were two Bills last session. One by Representative Juckett, one by Senator Glass. It was Senator Glass' Bill that was passed by the legislature, approved by the Governor. Does this Bill in any way effect that law?"

Calvo: "No it does not, it just goes to the next Bill."

Schlickman: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Horace, what number Bill was this before?"

Calvo: "I believe it was 797, it was reported out as tabled by the Committee Clerk and we discovered in checking the tape that it was unanimously passed and should have been...was intended to be on the consent calendar. That is the reason I lost track of it and discovered, you know, too late to introduce a new Bill under the deadlines, or at least to get it moved along under the deadline so we used the Committee Bill."

Geo-Karis: "I speak in favor of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it would be a good thing."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor indicate by voting aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this questions there's 122 ayes, 6 no, the Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Giorgi in the Chair."

Giorgi: "House Bill 3036."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3036. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Chicago Regional Port District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Maragos. Out of the record. 3040."

Jack O'Brien: "3040. Peters. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act."

Giorgi: "Take it out of the record and 3041 naturally out of the record also. 3052."



Jack O'Brien: "3052. Kozubowski."

Giorgi: "Out of the record. 3056."

Jack O'Brien: "3056."

Giorgi: "Representative Fennessey. 3056, Representative Fennessey, out of the record. 3061, Maragos. Out of the record or in the record. We'll call 3061."

Jack O'Brien: "3061. A Bill for an Act to create the Illinois State Property Tax Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Maragos and Beaupre."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this is a combination of three Bills and the chief sponsor of two of those Bills is Representative Beaupre so I'd rather have him be the chief spokesman on this particular legislation and then I'll cover for another part of this Bill. So please turn on the mike for Representative Beaupre for the chief sponsor of this Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Property Tax...State Wide Property Tax Commission Bill that we discussed at great length yesterday. As you know there were a number of questions, some of which we have tried to answer by taking it out of the record and discussing it with those who have come concerns about it. By and large this Property Tax Commission Bill is a recommendation of the Joint House Senate Revenue Committee on Property Tax Reform was introduced early in the session, has undergone very careful scrutiny by the House Revenue Committee and a Subcommittee of the House Revenue Committee, and was passed out on the floor by the Revenue Committee. The Bill basically sets up a three man, State-wide Property Tax Commission to be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. It creates a situation of three members with overlapping six year terms which we believe will go a long way towards addressing itself to taking the property tax assessment function out of politics by virtue of the fact that the appointments will be made by more than one Governor and will be of sufficient length and duration that there will be a degree of independence. I think



we discussed this Bill thoroughly yesterday, its one of the key measures of this session, I think, and I would ask for your favorable support."

Giorgi: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the sponsor yield to a question?"

Calvo: "Yes indeed."

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "I have no quarrel with what you are trying to do, but I would like to know where you established in keeping it out of politics, where you established the \$40,000 a year job? How did you arrive at that figure?"

Beaupre: "Well Representative Waddell, the original figure...the original Bill introduced...called for a \$50,000 a year salary by each...for each of the Commissioners. We believe that this will be one of the more important posts in State government...a...it is not a cabinet position because we wanted to remove...a...the Commissioners from the influence of the Executive Branch, but as far as their duties and functions...a...it will indeed be as important as the Director of any department in State government and...a...for that reason...a...the...a...figures were made commensurate with what we believe a person of the quality and qualifications desired for this position which would demand in...a...the free market place. I would point out to you, also, that the taxpayers federation who is very much in support of this measure...a...also agreed that the salary figure should be in this neighborhood so that we can command the kind of people and get the kind of people who understand the property tax structure, how it works and can be able administrators to administer the Commission."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Representative Choate."

Choate: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I withdraw the opposition that I announced yesterday as far as this measure is concerned. And the main reason being is that I was under the misapprehension of the tax increase as far as the taxpayers of this State are concerned, property taxpayers that is,



Representative Beaupre and Representative Skinner have ah... had lengthy conversations with me regarding this. The only thing I really truthfully wish is that you could further remove it from the political arena of the executive field that it presently is however I don't know that you can in this stage of the game so I am going to support this measure."

Giorgi: "Representative Tipword and then Representative Beatty."

Tipword: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Tipword: "In relation to this Bill ah... as I asked you yesterday ah... it mentions county assessors and township or ah... township assessors and multiple township assessors and you indicated that there might be a companion Bill or a Bill that ah... further discusses this same subject matter from the Revenue Committee and I noticed it was to be under consideration this morning. It would be very important to me on my vote on this matter what happened with the Revenue's Committee's consideration of ah.. former House Bill 3012 relating to township assessors."

Beaupre: "Well, Representative Tipword, ah.. that's a good question. As you know ah.. the property tax assessment levels have basically been broken down for ah... for our purposes into three levels. The state wide level ah.. which ah... the Property Tax Commission Bill addresses itself to and the county level where we are dealing with ah... legislation effecting the county supervisors of assessments and the township level where we're talking about legislation which deals with the township assessors. The ah.. two other levels ah.. that is to say the county level and the township level are addressed to in other Bills, which were before the House Revenue Committee today ah.. that Committee voted those Bills out ah... due pass and they will appear on the Calendar tomorrow as Committee Bills. There was some apprehension in regard to ah.. some of the provisions of those Bills, I would admit and that basically is the most controversial part of the package, but ah.. the Committee ah.. when listening to the explanation of votes, indicated that the Bills should be brought on the floor and discussed at length ah.. in



regard to county and township ah... levels of assessment procedure and they will be on the floor ah.. I presume by the end of this week."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question or two."

Giorgi: "Continue."

Beatty: "Mr. Beaupre, how many of these Commissioners would be appointed prior to January of 1976? By the current Governor?"

Beaupre: "Well, the law required ah.. the proposed law, I should say, will require that the appointments be made ah.. prior to January 2, 1976. But the Bill contains provisions that ah.. those initial appointments will be for two, four, and six year terms and thereafter, each appointment will be for a six year period. So the Commission will take effect January 1, 1976 with an initial three Commissioners, but then the terms will be staggered thereafter."

Beatty: "Could you tell me how long the Sub-Committee worked on this Bill? I understand that it's been in practice for a long time."

Beaupre: "Well, ah... as you know, Representative Beatty, the Joint House Senate Revenue Property Tax Reform Commission ah.. or Committee ah... conducted hearings for ah.. I believe two years. This was one of the major recommendations of that Commission. It was ah... the original Bill was drafted and presented to the Revenue Committee. It was sent to a Revenue Sub-Committee, which redrafted some of the provisions. Everyone who was involved in the tax collection and tax assessing process had input into the drafting in the Sub-Committee and it was brought back to the Revenue Committee and the Revenue Committee went over this Bill with a fine tooth comb. I believe that there has been a great deal of input by everybody concerned and basically we're talking about an agreed Bill that has been worked on for nearly two years by many many Members of this General Assembly."

Beatty: "Could you envision this as a Representative Skinner Retirement Bill? In other words, the Bill that some time in the future a man of his knowlkdge could be put in one of these Commission jobs. You think there's the kind of man you want? One that knows his



business and is willing to go at it?"

Beaupre: "Well, I certainly don't view it that way and I think it's up to the ah.. constituents of Representative Skinner's Legislative District to decide when he's to retire and ah.. if he is. I ah.. my guess is, however that Representative Skinner would probably not be one of the Governors favorites as an appointee."

Beatty: "Well, I was speaking in perhaps ah.... twenty years from now ah.. after Cal's put in his time. I didn't mean it in a uncomplimentary way. Thank you."

Giorgi: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thanks a lot ah.. by the way, Jack. I really appreciate that. Yesterday there were some questions ah... some very legitimate questions from the Members of the House as to what will make ah... what makes anybody who is supporting this Bill think that it will work any better than the present Department of Local Government Affairs does. Now this question has occured and reoccured from many sources, from township assessors, from supervisors of assessments, from legislators and from just taxpayers who know what's happening and know the way that the Department of Local Government Affairs has not obeyed the law. The answer to that question is that there is no way that we can make certain that the laws of the State of Illinois will be enforced. We can probably guarantee that somebody who is confident will occupy these three positions or indeed the position of the Director of the Department of Local Government Affairs. Unfortunately, confidence is not enough. What we need to create is an offical S.O.B. at the state level that we can blame for the very hard property tax decisions that have to be made and inforced in this state if we are not to misallocate ah... at least dozens if not hundreds of millions of dollars of various state aid through education, junior colleges, townhips for welfare purposes, tuberculosis districts and God knows how many other districts that are running around the state. We think this Bill can do it. It will do it if the Governor of the State of Illinois who makes the appointment makes appointments from those people who are qualified in this state who are men of good will. If he makes appointments



from those who want to cave in to the various interests to benefit from under assessments and uneven assessments, then this Property Tax Commission will work no better than the Department of Local Governmental Affairs has worked in recent memory. I think it's to be pointed out that the assesement problem is a very complex and interrelated problem. We have found that if you break into different portions according to level of assessment responsibility, you can make minimal sense of it. The administration likes to blame the local assessors for all of the problems in the State of Illinois. Well, God knows that the local assessor have more than enough blame to go around, but I would contend that if you're not getting instructions from the state level, that one should go a little easy before one condemns the local township assessor and the local supervisor of assessments. If this Commission doesn't do a better job than the Department of Local Governmental Affairs does in the next three years, I suspect you will see Representative Beaupre, myself, Representative Schraeder, Representative Maragos and every other Member of this House who knows anything about property taxes in this state Co-Sponsoring a Bill to abolish this Commission and to put it back under the Governor or something more serious than that. I would sincerely solicit your favorable vote on this Bill. It will not solve the problem, but it goes about one third of the way and a very neccessary third of the way."

Giorgi: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel that this group is giving entirely too little attention to this very important Bill. This is a good Bill. It has been studied extensively. It is aimed at a very serious problem and I hope that this House will take and pay heed to this legislation and give it an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Giorgi: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Beaupre: "He will."

Mautino: "O'okay. Jack, what are the effects of this Commission and this piece of legislation as compared to 3012? What effects would



there be if one passes and the other doesn't?"

Beaupre: "Well, in regard to the other two levels of the assessment process ah... and the relationship between this Bill and those, ah.. this Bill was drafted in its final draft form to assume that the other two Bills would pass. However, being aware of a good deal of opposition to ah.. any changes at the other levels of the assessment process, we have prepared Amendments, which are prepared to be offered at any juncture along the legislative process including Conference Committees or would be recommended to the Governor for an amendatory veto ah... should the other Bills not pass ah.. and we can clear up the language in this Bill to make it conform to the local situation as it exists today."

Mautino: "You're saying then ah.. by passage of this legislation, the effect would be ah... no effect on 3012. Is that what you're saying?"

Beaupre: "That's correct. It has some language in it making reference to multi-township assessors, which as you know ah.. is a part of the other Bill, but ah.. that language will be taken out ah.. should the other Bill not pass."

Giorgi: "Representative Stone."

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

Giorgi: "Representative Stone.....are you going to close, Representative Maragos? The previous question has been moved. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the previous question has been moved. Representative Maragos to close."

Maragos: "All right, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House ah... I would like to state one important factor that has not been pointed ah... or fully stressed in this Bill and which may alleviate the fears that were brought up by Representative Skinner and I state on a positive note that we have some insurance that the Commission if it's appointed and this law passes, there will be a overview by the Legislature because one of the main portions of this Bill creates a Property Tax Legislative Advisory Committee which are ah... consist of six Members of the House Revenue Committee and six Members of the Senate Revenue Committee."



Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Maragos. The T.V. camera are going to be aimed at the House Members for the rest of the afternoon, I think. Go ahead, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "And I would like to bring out the fact that this particular piece of legislation was studied for almost two years by the Joint House Senate Committee of which Representative Skinner and Representative Baupre were an ethical part ah... as well as Representative Schraeder ah.. I think it was. More importantly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Legislative Committee will have an overview ah... it will have rights to ask the various agencies and commissions and all state officers to cooperate for the Committee and to provide requested information. So I think for the first time that we have built in safeguards by the Legislature to see that this Commission does function as the Legislature wants it. The Supreme Court has stated and many other people have stated that the responsibility should be given back to the Legislature to act. We have to face this thing because the other agencies have defaulted in the past and it is up to us ah... responsible Members of the Legislature to make the headway out of the chaos which exist today in the tax system of the State of Illinois. In closing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to commend Representative Baupre and Representative Skinner and the other Members of the Joint Committee for all of the years and efforts that they've put in to bring about House Bill 990 and the efforts of this particular House Bill 3061. We have two other Bills that are coming down the pike. One which was filed this afternoon, 3117 which can be changed if we want to, but has Representative Baupre has stated; this Bill is tailor made so that if certain other Bills do not come into focus, this can be amended either in the Senate or other legislative process to do the job so that it can stand alone. We ask for your ultimate support and to do something for possible tax reform in this state and I ask for a green light."

Giorgi: "The question is shall House Bill 3061 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no' and Representative Cunningham to explain his vote."



Cunningham: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All of these well intentioned and misinformed comments to the context notwithstanding, this is a very bad Bill. It should be defeated. The fact that it has been beaten the other two times that it was up and that was avoided postponed consideration was not an accident. The reason it should be defeated notwithstanding the score up there are these. First, it raises the price of the head of the organization from the present \$37,000 to \$120,000. It costs more to have three bureaucrats at the feed trough than one. That's just common sense. We talk about the money situation being so tight here and yet we create a monster that will distroy taxpayers money faster than it can be printed. The second reason that it should be defeated is that it's divided authority. One of the Representatives has the temerity to say we need an S.O.B. accessible that we can blame. We already have that individual. I won't use that descriptive term, but he certainly... he certainly has been blamed unmerciably and unfairly by the Gentleman from Crystal Lake in his comments in this regard. The third reason that it should be defeated.... be quite over there.... has to do with the township assessors. The same fine Committee that brought you 3061 brought you 3012 and if you don't believe that this is a foot in the door for the elimination of your township assessors, you just don't know what's happening. You should remember that the people who send you the mail back home have a better concept of then you. For all these reasons..... despite the loud unthinking noises that you hear, you should be voting 'no'."

Giorgi: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I fail to see why three Members appointed by the Governor confirmed by the Senate are any more responsible than one guy appointed by the Governor confirmed by the Senate. Now they tell me that a camel is a horse put together by a Committee. Now we're forming a three man Committee to do what one man is delegated the responsibility of doing. That just doesn't make sense to me because we're not pin pointing responsibility, we're scattering it out to where you never will find the



guy that's responsible."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 130 'ayes' and 18 'nays' and 1 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Roscoe told me to either speak for the Bill or against it, whichever I thought was better and I'd like to thank him at this point."

Giorgi: "House Bill 3067."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3067. A Bill to create the Illinois Health Finance Committee. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Beaupre, do you want to go on with 3067?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, ah.. that's a mistake on the Calendar. That ah.... Representative Chapman is the principal Sponsor of that Bill."

Giorgi: "Is Ms. Chapman on the floor? O'kay then we'll go on to ah... take that out of the record. 3069, Gene Barnes."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3069. A Bill for an Act creating the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Since this was originally House Bill 1554 and Representative Geo-Karis was the principal Sponsor I would like to defer to her."

Giorgi: "I don't see her on the floor. Do you want to take it out of the record?"

Barnes: "Yes, Sir."

Giorgi: "Take it out of the record. 3078. Representative Calvo on House Bill 3078."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3078."

Giorgi: "Take it out of the record. 308... o'okay.... the whole series out. 3084, Mr. Schoeberlein. Is he on the floor? Out of the record. 3092, Choate. Out of the record. 3093, Hirschfeld. He'll take it."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3093. A Bill for an Act to amend the University Civil Service Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?"

Choate: "I would like to point out to the Membership, Mr. Speaker, that



there is an error in the Calendar and the only reason that I'm taking 3092 out is because due to an error ah.. somewhere along the line, 3091 was inadvertently left from the Calendar and I want to have them together. And hopefully, we can get back to them sometime today."

Giorgi: "It will be on the Supplemental Calendar, the Clerk advises me. 3093, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3093 is a successor Bill to House Bill 2582, which got caught on the Friday escapade of a few weeks ago. This Bill will provide eleven paid holidays for officers and employees of the various state universities throughout the State of Illinois in order to bring them up to the same standards that other state employees have in this state. When we had the Bill originally, the various universities opposed the Bill due to the fact that the employees had a right to choose the the days that they got off and it it fell on a holiday and there was school going on, the employees could still have that day off. The Bill has been changed to permit the universities to choose which day the employees will have off in order to remove the possibility of financial hardship and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 3093."

Giorgi: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 3093 pass. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Hirschfeld, do you want to explain just a little further ah.. for a moment?"

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there was no opposition to the Bill. I don't know what the problem is on the voting. Ah... all this does is give the employees of the various state universities the same holidays that the state employees have throughout the State of Illinois. And ah.. it effects, of course, the Board of Regions, the Board of Governors, S.I.U. and U.of I. All of the employees at these various universities are for it. Labor is 100% behind the Bill and ah.. I'm carrying it for them. I think that we should be able to get 89 votes on there without any trouble."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Hanahan on House



Bill 3093."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the employees at the university that would be covered by the provision of this Act that specifically requested this Bill, so that it clears up for both management and labor the responsibilities of granting the ah... the rights of payment when there is a holiday. It's a good Bill and it should pass overwhelming. It has in the past and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes' and 7 'nays' and 14 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Terzich..... is Representative Porter in the Chamber? I'm sorry, Representative Stone."

Stone: "What? On which Bill?"

Giorgi: "I was just going to call 3094 and Mr. Porter is not in the Chambers so I was going to go to 3095, unless you have some inquiry. 3095, James Houlihan."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3095."

Giorgi: "Representative Lechowicz on 3095."

Jack O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3095 is a Committee Bill similar to a House Bill which was tied in the Appropriations I Committee. It was heard at the same time that as the Governor's Accelerated Bond Program. It has nothing to do with the accelerated bonds. House Bill 3095 raises from 8 to 8.5 the maximum interest rate on bonds and those issued under the Act and raises from \$500,000,000 to \$800,000,000 the limitation on the aggregate principal amount of outstanding bonds and notes for the Illinois Housing Development Act."

Giorgi: "Any further questions?"

Lechowicz: "If there are any questions, I would be more than happy to ah... respond."

Giorgi: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 3095



pass. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mann on House Bill 3095."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the original Sponsor ah... I see you have the vote steady. It's a good Bill and I hope you vote 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes' and 16 'nays' and 1 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. I understand the Sponsor of House Bill 3096 wants to return it to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Do you request leave?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I seek leave of the House to return House Bill 3096 for the purpose of an Amendment."

Giorgi: "O'kay. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave has been granted. 3096 is now on Second Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beaupre. Amends House Bill 3096 on page 1, line 11 by deleting and so forth."

Giorgi: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, can we take this out of the record for the moment?"

Giorgi: "Take it out of the record. Representative Terzich on 3098. Representative Stone on 3098."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3098. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 3098 was formerly House Bill 2910, which passed out of the Personnel Intentions Committee ah... with a vote of 15 to 1. This Bill amends the General Assembly retirement system ah... of the Pension Code and merely provides that salary for pension purposes shall include the amounts received as per diem expense allowances beginning with January 1 of the year 1975. As all of you know, the Internal Revenue Service ruled that our per diem allowance payment for income for income tax purposes. They provided that the State of Illinois was obliged to give us ah... W-2 withholding statements on



the per diem money that we received and they required that we include it with our other salary for the purpose of paying income tax. On this basis, since it is income to us the same as the rest of our salary, I believe that it should be included for our pension purposes. I would appreciate your 'yes' vote on the Bill."

Giorgi: "Any further discussion? Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Schuneman: "Representative Stone, if I understand you correctly, ah.. what you're saying is that the money that we receive that is the per diem as an expense allowance will now be added to our salary in computing the pension benefits that ah... that ah... that we will receive. Is that correct?"

Stone: "No, Sir. Your statement is not correct. The Internal Revenue Service has stated that our per diem payments were not expense allowances, that it was to be considered as additional compensation the same as the twenty-five ah... you weren't here the last time, Sir, but we received a \$2500 increase in salary ah... last Session we received \$17,500. This time our salary was raised to \$20,000. The additional \$2500 we pay ah... we pay ah.. pension on. Now the Internal Revenue Service has stated that this ah... that the per diem payment is compensation the same as the additional \$2500 that we received this year over last year. Now ah... there's not question but what if the ah.. our salaries were subject to social security that the state would be obligated to withhold social security... there's no question about it. So since social security is in effect, ah.. a certain pension that it seems to me that it is only fair that this money be included in our pension. Now ah.. several years ago.... not many years ago.... but before you came, our ah.. we did not receive the per diem allowance. We were still allowed to take from our income tax the exact same amount of expenses that we're allowed now, which is our actual expenses. These we were allowed to take before we received ah.... before we took them out of our income tax, in other words.... actual expenses. That is all we're allowed to do now in the exact same way that we were



doing it before. Now if we were not receiving the per dium allowance, but were receiving only \$20,000 a year, we would be allowed to take the exact same amount out of the \$20,000 that we're now allowed to take out of the total wages we've received. Therefore, ah... the argument that our per diem ah..... that we should not pay pension on our per diem does not hold because we have always paid pension out of the total money received."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I asked the Sponsor a question and I don't believe I got an answer to the question, but I do believe I understand the Bill. So I would like to speak to the Bill."

Giorgi: "Continue."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if we adopt this Bill ah.. what we would be doing is adding a sum of money each year to our salary for the purpose of computing our General Assembly pension. Now if we spend 100 days in Session this year, we're each going to receive \$3600 in per diem. That means that our pension for this year will be computed on a salary of not \$20,000 but \$23,600. I submit to you that that's wrong. This is not a proper way for this House to proceed. This is a principle which is contrary to pension benefits received by anybody else. For example, those people are employees of industry have their pensions based upon their salary, not upon their salary plus expenses. And I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this very bad Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Giorgi: "He will."

Kosinski: "Paul, ah.. not I do understand what you inferred on the I.R.S. ruling that they will include our per diem as part of our salary and then we will have to justify that per diem in terms of expenses. Is that correct?"

Stone: "Yes, Sir."

Kosinski: "But whether this Bill passes or does not pass, that won't change I.R.S. ruling. They still will insist on that, will they not?"

Stone: "That is correct, Sir."



Kosinski: "So actually all this Bill does is builds us up a reserve for retirement, doesn't it?"

Stone: "Yes, Sir."

Kosinski: "Thank you."

Stone: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to fortify what the Sponsor of this Bill said just a minute ago with regard to ah.. what we generally call expenses ah... the per diem that we receive as income. I was put on a Committee of this Body who was sent to confer with the Internal Revenue Service Office here in the City of Springfield as to what they payment actually is. And they advised us at that time that that was income. It could not be treated as expenses in any way. You could only treat as expenses those things that are actual expenses that you have in serving in this Legislature and that otherwise all of that per diem is actually income. They advised us at time that those Members of the Legislature who live in Springfield or very close who had announced their intention of not taking the per diem expense, the advised us that whether they took that per diem or not, they would be charged with that sum that they were entitled to on the per diem as income upon which they would be taxed by the Federal Internal Revenue Service strictly and solely as income and advised that if they wished any of their money to pay their taxes, they better collect it. They made very very clear that the per diem is income and nothing else."

Giorgi: "Representative Griesheimer."

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

Giorgi: "He indicates that he will."

Griesheimer: "Representative Stone, as you know ah.. I carried the Bill that was the ah... the vehicle for the Amendment last term on this matter and I would just like to have you indicate ah.... will the increase deduction for retirement benefits also be deducted from our per diem as it is presently done with our basic salary?"

Stone: "Absolutely, yes."

Griesheimer: "Under those conditions, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak to the Bill. I hope that that answer clarifies this situation."



There is absolutely no question that this money is ordinary income to us. We're not getting \$36.00 a day clear to apply to our expenses down here. We are getting \$36.00 less withholding taxes ah.. which in effect, not being withheld at the present time but for which we are taxed on April 15th of each year. We'll also have deducted from that ordinary income an amount necessary to build our retirement fund. Therefore, it is only fair that this money, which I.R.S. considers as ordinary income and the State of Illinois by the way, considers as ordinary income, be added to the retirement. And although we'll have no application to some of the freshman and sophomores in this House for many many years, I think it is fair for those Members who have been in the House for a number of years to add this and I urge your 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Stone to close. I have no one else asking for the floor."

Stone: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the Gentleman who spoke in opposition to the Bill I say that this ah... that our per diem is in no way comparable to the expense accounts received by people in industry. That is a return of ah... money spend in ah.. in business or in doing the job. This is in no way comparable to that. I believe that this is a good Bill and I solicit your support."

Giorgi: "The question is ah.... I indicated ah... would you qualify your vote, Mr. Madison? The question is shall House Bill 3098 pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no' and Representative Madison to qualify his vote."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to raise a question of the Sponsor and maybe he can answer my question through an explanation of his vote."

Giorgi: "Why don't you raise the question?"

Madison: "Yes, I noticed that the Digest indicated that ah.. this is to take effect with the beginning of 1975 and what I wanted to find out from the Sponsor is whether or not the deductions from the per diem would be retroactive from January 1."

Giorgi: "Representative Stone, when you qualify your vote ah.. maybe you can answer that question."

Stone: "Yes, Sir. It was my intention and I believe the Bill is clear



that this would go back to January 1 of ah.. of this year and that the money that we've received to date we would necessarily have to pay into our pension fund."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 97 'ayes' and 42 'nays' and 7 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Caldwell..... Higher Education.... I'm sorry, 3102."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3102. A Bill for an Act creating the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Caldwell on House Bill 3102."

Caldwell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, ah... House Bill 3102 was formally House Bill 2160 and it was one of the many Bills ah... I think you're about four away from me when we closed business on the 23rd of May. This Bill establishes the vocational and education ah... Vocational and Rehabilitation Department as a Code Division in the ah... as a Code Division. It's really ah.. has always functioned separately from the Department of Vocational Education, but ah.. it's now necessary to establish a separate department and this is what this Bill does. This Bill was heard twice in the ah... Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education and passed out with ah... I think one or two decenting votes. I urge its adoption. I would be glad to answer any questions."

Giorgi: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Macdonald on House Bill 3102."

Macdonald: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor will yield for a question."

Giorgi: "He indicates that he will."

Macdonald: "Ah... Representative Caldwell, I notice on this Bill that it has no form approval nor does it have any stamp from the Legislative Reference Buearu. Ah... what is the ruling on that? Maybe we can find out from the Chair about Bills that ah... I thought all Bills had to go through the Legislative Reference Bureau or at least have a form stamp."

Caldwell: "Ah... I'm not familiar with the stamp, Ms. Macdonald. I



think you will recall that ah.. when we had this Bill up before the close of ah.. Committee Bills in the ah... for our deadline on the 23rd. Ah... this Bill, as I indicated, was heard in Elementary and Secondary Education and ah... subjected to a very through examination and ah... it could be that if I read this one paragraph to you ah... that it may satisfy your question. It says, 'The Office of Superintendent of Instruction recommended as a result of joint task force study that Vocational Education should no longer operate under the Board of Edu.... Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. It was felt that Vocational Education should be moved to the jurisdiction of the Office of State Education. As a result, it was recommended by our board that these be V.E.R. be made a Code Department with an advisory council'. So when we ah... we the ah... the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education ah... made this as a Committee Bill and ah.. it went through the process that was established ah.. after we ah.. had our close on the 23rd of May. 2161 went through the Reference Bureau and was ah.. adopted and it was through the regular process."

Macdonald: "I realize that it is a technical point, but in looking over the other Bills, which are Committee Bills, I do not find other Bills that do not ah... at least have the form stamp from the Legislative Reference Buearu and I just wondered what the procedure was in ah..."

Caldwell: "Maybe I can get some help from the Chairman of the Committee, Representative Schneider."

Gorgi: "Representative Schneider, please."

Macdonald: "I thought it absolutely had to be approved."

Gorgi: "Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, I can't help. I don't know how the cover sheet got on, Jenny. We just reported the Bill when we had the copies and I didn't double check for that as a matter of fact. So it went by me and if it does require a Legislative Reference Bureau approval, it was inadvertant and I overlooked it, but I have not ah.. working familiarity with the rules as it relates to that question. Maybe the Speaker can double check on it. The question



seems to be that ah.. the Bill ah.. the Committee Bill apparently did not go through the Legislative Reference Bureau for approval of form. It is in order ah... because we considered it in that form, but we did not have a cover sheet that indicated that at the time for consideration. So you will have to make a determination, I can't."

Giorgi: "Just a moment, Chicago. Ms. Macdonald, what's your question?"

Macdonald: "I had a further question of the Sponsor, if I may, please?"

Giorgi: "Continue."

Macdonald: "Representative Caldwell, as you know ah.. I have a special interest in this Bill. Now ah.. I had a similar Bill ah... the Department on the Handicapped as you remember, which is in the Sub-Committee of the Appropriations Committee and I have been working rather significantly toward ah.. some inturim work in the summer on this Bill. My understand is that in the State of Illinois, we may stand to loose ah.. some federal funds if indeed we are not very careful about the responsibilities that we give the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. Have all of these possibilities been covered very throughly by the Committee and with the federal guidelines?"

Caldwell: "They have, Ms. Macdonald. Let me ah... further ah.. to answer you question about the technicality... I mean if you care to, I'll pull it out of the record and take it to the Reference Bureau, but there's no ah.. let me just read this last ah... couple of paragraphs here. It says, "Why a Code Department, Why Not?" 'The Division currently employees approximately 1,290 people. Every other agency within this state which approaches outside ah.. and even those agencies which do not have Code Departments status secondly confirmed department status on V.E.R. will not cost the state any additional money. Finally, there's no opposition to the administration phase of it. There's not danger that the handicapped in Illinois will loose their voice in terms of impacting services to the disabled. The provision for an advisory council assures that the handicapped will have input into program and delivery of services to the handicapped of Illinois'. As I said before, we ah.. because



of your interest and that of others, this Bill was very thoroughly explored by all departments. Now if you care to, I can take this technical business with the Reference Bureau ah..."

Macdonald: "Well, I think that ought to be a ruling from the Chair, Representative Caldwell. If ah.. if it is required in the rules ah.. you know, I really am not making more than a point about it so ah..I think that ruling would have to come from the Chair or ah.. I understood that all Bills had to be approved ah..."

Giorgi: "Would you take it out of the record temporarily and we'll check on this. We'll take it out of the record momentarily. We'll come back to it. Representative Pierce on House Bill 3103. Clerk, read 3103."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3103. A Bill for an Act to create the Land Resources and Management Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3103 is a Committee Bill of the Committee on Environment Energy and Natural Resources. What we did was when House Bill 338, which passed out of the Committee for the Land Resources Management Study Commission, which Representative Richard Mugalian had worked on so hard and prepared, that was approved in both our Committee and in Appropriations Committee, but on the last night for Bills ah.. it wasn't reached. So on House Bill 338 with the Amendments has been put on the floor including the one for the Southwestern Regional Planning Commission. When that came back to our Committee we took the Bill, House Bill 338, with the two Amendments that Representative Mugalian had worked on so hard and put that out as a Committee Bill, which is now before you, House Bill 3103. In view of the fact that the Bill is the work and the draftmanship of Representative Mulgalian ah.. I would like at this time ah.. he's not a Members of our Committee, but he was the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 338, I would like at this time to yield to Representative Mugalian to explain in more detail the Bill that was really his Bill originally, now known as House Bill 3103, but originally House Bill 338 creating

Planner



the Land Resources Management Study Commission."

Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to hear with this Bill, House Bill 339, which is also on Third Reading and is a companion Appropriation Bill?"

Giorgi: "The Gentleman requests leave to hear House Bill 339 as a companion. Does he have leave? Any opposed? Leave is granted. House Bill 339, ah.. read it a third time, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 339. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Land Resources Study Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Mugalain."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 338 and ah... House Bill ah.. which is now House Bill 3103, a Committee Bill, which created the Land Resources Management Study Commission. The Commission would consist of eighteen Members. Ten would be Members of the Legislature and eight would be public members. Four of the public members are appointed by the Legislative Leadership, that is one by the President of the Senate and one by the Senate Minority Leader and so forth. The remaining four Members would be appointed as follows. One by the Illinois Municipal League and one by the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, one by the Southwestern Illinois Metropolitan and Regional Planning Commission and the fourth by the Director of Agriculture. The Commission will report to the 80th General Assembly by February 1, 1977. The scope of the Commission Study is as comprehensive as it can be. One assignment is to study the effectiveness of municipal zoning on areas outside, but adjacent to municipalities. Another is to study the effect of land use regulations on school districts. Also to consider the fact that urbanization follows or is dependent on the availability of sanitary sewer facilities. Public hearings are required throughout the state and the Membership of the Commission will be representative of the geographical and diversified economic and other interests of the state. Very generally and very briefly, this Bill and the compensation of the Commission and its powers follow the



recommendation of a legislator's guide to land management published in 1974, December, by the Council of State Government. Now I have distributed several weeks ago ah.. a written explanation of what this Bill does. I ah.. I know that we don't have enough time to fully discuss this very comprehensive subject and the need for the Commission in this area, but I might say that it is said that in the next thirty years our country will build as many buildings, homes, school facilities and other installations as this country has built since the time it was founded. The question of land use is a time bomb. It is ticking away. And I suggest that this Legislature has not addressed itself to the multiplicity of the difficult complex important problems that this Commission would consider. And the reason that a Commission is suggested is that I know of no one who has a solution to these very vexing problems. I don't have a solution. The way that this Bill is written suggests no preconceived solutions, but Ladies and Gentlemen, we must work very hard over the next year and a half with a Commission to come up with some sense and some rationality and some priorities so that legislative proposals can be introduced by the next General Assembly. The reason that I suggest that a Commission is necessary is that in a very delicate sensitive area of land use, which involves ah.. places likescenic rivers, school boards, real estate taxation, land planning of all kinds, municipal problems,... is that we have unfortunately too many set attitudes on the part of certain people. We have too many conflicts... or imagined conflicts and what we need is a deliberative study of this with representation by all of these diverse interests and by all of the experts that Illinois can find in order to solve this ticking... ticking time bomb that we have that could really destroy the orderly growth of Illinois. I ask for your support."

Giorgi: "I'm going to start indicating how many people want to speak. I have four people indicating they want to speak on this issue... five. Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."



Lauer: "Ah... Representative Mugalian, what do you anticipate the cost of this Commission would be?"

Mugalian: "The appropriation as in House Bill 339, which is also being considered, is \$50,000."

Lauer: "\$50,000?"

Mugalian: "Yes."

Lauer: "Is the make-up of the board the same as it was in House Bill 338?"

Mugalian: "With the Amendment, yes."

Lauer: "The Amendment puts ah..."

Mugalian: "The Amendment specifically added a Members or ah.. an appointment by the Southwest Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission, which is...."

Lauer: "Does it then give the majority of ah.. the Commission to Members of the Legislature or ah.. non Legislative Members?"

Mugalian: "Ten of the eighteen Members must be Legislators and of the eight public members, four are picked by the Leadership of both Houses so that in a sense you might say that fourteen of the eighteen are either Legislators or appointed by the Legislature."

Lauer: "And the scope of the Committee ah.. mandates ah.. is completely unrestricted? Is that so?"

Mugalian: "That's ah.. probably a good way to put it. Ah... it's very comprehensive."

Lauer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, if I may address the Bill?"

Giorgi: "Continue, please."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again we have a situation where we are being asked to set up a Commission and spend money which the Governor has said that we are short of and I think we'll all agree that we are.... a little bit short to conduct studies to tell people how to handle their affairs. We come in with the attitude that the Gentlemen in Springfield know best. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that the Gentlemen in Springfield do not always know best. Rather, we have here one more situation of big brotherism. The attitude that is indicated by the



attempt to creat this Commission reminds me very much of the general attitude of the environmentalists of all of those who ah... subscribe to the idea of big brotherism. Probably, they can best be discribed as being a kin to the midget in the nudist colony running around sticking his nose in everybodys business. I would strongly submit that we don't need another Commission especially ah... we don't need this Commission. I strongly solcit a 'no' vote."

Giorgi: "Representative Skinner."

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

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Can you tell me what provisions you have made in this Bill to make sure that Legislators ah.. to understand the property tax situation, Legislators to understand the interest of agriculture and Legislators to understand the interests of environmentalists ah... are represented on this Commission?"

Mugalian: "Mr. Skinner, we dicussed that ah... I really don't disagree in principle and I would suggest that the Legislative Leadership consider in making their appointments ah.. Membe.....Representatives from those Committees. I will, ah.. when it goes to the Senate... if it does, indicate my willingness to accept an Amendment that would do that."

Skinner: "If I might speak to the Bill."

Giorgi: "Continue."

Skinner: "Throughout this Session in every Committee that I have served on that is considered the general topic of open space and one the floor of this House I have complained ah... sometimes rather strongly, at the lack of a mechanism... the total lack of a mechanism this year to consider a very important subject. You can call it preferential taxation ah.. for farmers. You can call it open face, you can call it scenic rivers, you can call it agriculture districts, you can call it anything you want, but no Bill in this area has got to every Committee that it should have gotten to. Since we split the Agriculture Committee from the Environment Committee, we've lost that check and balance. Now last Session, if a Bill had gone



through that... that Committee and through the Revenue Committee every base would have been touched. This year we are touching one out of every three bases. I do not like the make-up of this Commission. I think a Joint Sub-Committee ah... a tripartite Joint Sub-Committee of the Revenue Committee, the Environment Committee and the Agriculture Committee could do the same job that this Commission could do if it had the right membership on it. We need to address a subject. Perhaps Representative Lauer has not felt the pressure in his area, but I guarantee you that I have felt the pressure in my area. We're no longer discussing in McHenry County and Lake County and McKane County whether land speculators and land owners are paying their fair share of the tax burdens... these are the homeowners, what we're discussing now is how we keep the open space open. Now I don't whether this Commission can come up with an answer to that, but if it can it's going to be worth several times \$50,000 to up our prosperity. I would just wish that Representative Mugalian would take this back to Second Reading and either accept the Amendment that I have lying on the Clerk's table or come up with a better one of his own."

Giorgi: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to address the Sponsor of the Bill, if I may."

Giorgi: "Continue."

Yourell: "Representative Mugalian, are you aware that in the Counties and Townships Study Calendar there are six Bills that deal with not only with the Land Management, but all that that entails such as zoning, municipal school districts and the whole ah.. the whole area of land management and zoning from the local ageas to the state area. And it's my understanding that there are several Bills in Cities and Villages that deal with this subject. Representative Schlickman, as you all know, had a very profound interest in legislation of this nature and I believe introduced the first legislation having to do with this subject matter. And that identical Bill sponsored with me now ah.. resides on the Study Calendar of the Counties and Townships Committee and it was the feeling of



the Chairman of ah.. not only that Committee, but the Chairman of the Cities and Villages Committee of this House, that they would form a Committee to go into a indepth study of all of the legislation dealing in this important subject through the summer months and the fall months so that we could possibly arrive with some conclusions for presentation in a Bill ah.. that would probably answer all of the questions if ah.. if that is possible which ah.. probably is problematical, but the question to you is that is it proper to suggest to you at this time that ah.. we referred some of those Bills that I spoke to ah.. to this Commission should this Commission become a reality?"

Mugalian: "Is you question whether or not the proposals you refer to should be submitted to the Commission? If that's the question, I would agree."

Yourell: "Ah.. I don't know what the feeling is of the Members of the Committee that have been selected so far to serve on this Subcommittee or the Interim Study Calendar Committee of the Counties and Townships Committee, but I would hope that you contact the Chairman of those two Committees that I mentioned if this Bill should pass and perhaps ah.. some of those Members on those two Committees be appointed to the Commission."

Mugalian: "Yes, Representative Yourell. I think that your suggestions are very... very good and in a way parallel to those of Representative Skinner and ah.. I also agree with the concept of Representative Skinner's remarks."

Giorgi: "Represnetative Hudson."

Hudson: "Would the ah.. thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Hudson: "Representative Mugalian, I wanted a ah... response to you as to whether or not you didn't feel that this ah.. Commission, if it were to be set up, would be ah.. duplicatory? I realize that that question was just posed, but I would like to clear ah... don't you feel that your Commission would be duplicatory ah... of the efforts being made by others?"



Giorgi: "Excuse me, Gentlemen. We're going to turn the camera light off ah... T.V. light off so that ah... no pictures are allowed now. Continue on, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Representative Hudson, it would not be duplicative of any proposal that I have seen before this General Assembly. There are suggestions and Bills proposed that would deal with small segments of the entire Land Resources Management area, which is of course a very vast area. For example, it includes the siting of power plants. That would be one aspect of ah... of..."

Hudson: "The setting of what?"

Mugalian: "The siting of power plants. Representative Maragos had a Bill that dealt with the siting of power plants."

Hudson: "Yes, ah.. I remember it well."

Mugalian: "So my answer is, no. It is not duplicative. What this Commission does or would hope to do would be to correlate and intergrate of the entire vast area that has some kind of relationship with what we call land resources management. That includes agriculture land, tax policy, ah... power generating plants, streams and rivers, zoning... zoning, for example, is only one aspect of land resources study."

Hudson: "Don't you feel... do you feel that the possibility is here ah... following up Representative ah.. Lauer's line of questioning that the possibility might be here that ah.. we would indeed be inviting big brother in ah... to decisions where big brother might best be left out here?"

Mugalian: "Well, I would like to answer that one, yes. There has been some talk about big brother and I yield to no one in this Chamber... my fear about having big brother overlook anything that we do. The fact is that the federal government right now has sixty programs... 60 programs... that deal with land use regulation. If we ah.. if the state doesn't respond to this problem adequately, the federal government, as it has done in many cases, will attempt to take over. One of the goals of this Commission is to see that we don't get a big brother from Washington telling us how to manage our own land. So that the answer is ah.. if you want to avoid big brotherism, and



no one wants to do that more than I, you would support a serious study ah.. to the end that the state can manage its own problems in this very complex area."

Hudson: "I have one more question, Representative ah... and then if I may I'll speak to the Bill. My final question would be ah... I notice in Paragraph (b) of the Bill under what the Commission may do, it may consider the fisibility of granting to regional councils of local government or two or more units of local government and so forth and so forth.... ah.... of some measure of land planning or zoning authority in areas located there both within and without the boundries of said local government. Now I remember when we set up the R.T.A. we set up a unit of local government. We also set up a Regional Government. Would the possibility exist here that we could end up ah.. with the R.T.A. ah.. entering into ah.. land use and land control via this route?"

Mugalian: "Representative Hudson, the New Constitution has authorized ah.. intergovernmental cooperation and we now have statutes on the books that authorize councils of government. There are several in the state. In my own district there is a council called the Barrington Area Council of Government. That is a consortium of about ten villages in the area such as Barrington, Tower Lakes and so forth... that are already operating as a council of government trying to meet some of their common problems. So we already have that. What this Bill would do ah.. among other things, would be to study the effectiveness of that and ah.. and perhaps permit that kind of device to continue in order to avoid regional management for R.T.A. So in effect, ah.. this Bill ah.. if it has an bias at all, would try to see that... would try to see if local governments working together could solve these problems rather than forming any kind of a metro-government."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure that Representative Mugalian is ah.. well intended in his Bill. I have the highest respect for the Representative, but I do feel that the results of this Commission and the results of this Bill might be quite the oppposite of what he invisions they would be.



In fact, the Commission.... the Commission itself, as it's set up and what it can do and what it cannot do... cannot do, under the provisions of the Bill, I will suggest will play into the very hands of the ah.. big brother government that so many of us fear and so many of us invasion under this new concept of regional government that seems to be progressing at such a rapid pace. Now I would refer you to provisions of the Bill itself. In Section (c) it has ah... it says ah.. this is one of the things that it may do and it itself ah.. I suppose that there is no harm in it, but it says, 'consider the value or potential value of all land resources management policy and tools including, but not limited to proposals for national land use planning legislation'.... but the intriguing part to me is we get down here to regulation of complex sources of air pollution and then the establishment of scenic river programs by way of easements, use limitations, the exercise of eminent domain or otherwise, state regulation of flood plane, airport zoning regulations, conservancy districts, port authorities, transfer of development rights, regulation of new communities, governmental boundary and land planning agreements and laws, including special tax assessment provisions, etc, etc. Now what I'm trying to do, Ladies and Gentlemen is suggest to some of you here who were so concerned about the power siting Bill that Representative Mugalian has already eluded to. You were concerned about eminent domain provisions in that Bill. We went so ah... we ah... we amended that Bill, as you recall, to virtually strike those out so that the local authorities would have a say and I'm just thinking that if this Commission is set up and begins to really get its wheels going, we are going to begin to take more and more rights, prerogatives away from the local people, from you local units of government and we're going to throw these decisions into a higher unit of government which indeed, in fact, is big brotherism and I'm urging you to think very carefully before we set up a Commission of this kind with the powers and the authority and the sweeping purview of authority that it has."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Hudson. Mr. Meyers."



Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Giorgi: "Continue."

Meyer: "Mr. Mugalian, can you site any other Bill or Statute that would give a private organization like the Municipal League, the right to make an appointment on a Legislated Commission?"

Mugalian: "Not in this area, but that's why I think that this is a creative Bill."

Meyer: "If I may speak to the Bill?"

Giorgi: "Continue, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "When I first came to the Legislature in 1966 we had the Governor making half of the appointments to the Commission. Since then, and it was a battle that raged through '68 and into '70. Finally we got the Executive out of the Legislature. It was bad enough that we had the Executive making appointments, but now we've got the Municipal League in this proposed Bill making appointments. Now there's certain Members in this Body ... this Legislative Hall that are opposed to Commissions and I being one of them. Quite frankly we can't have public members representing private interest. We'll never get Bills that pass. This Bill... this concept should be studied by a Joint Committee or ah... possibly three Committees with three different Committee Bills. Ladies and Gentlemen, I speak with some experience in this area because in 1971 I did get a Land Use Bill that was called the Scenic River Bill out of the House, with over 130 votes for it. Now the reason it got out was because it was a product of this Legislature and a Member of this Legislature. It wasn't a product of a group of people grinding special interest acts. For that reason, I am opposed to this Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Peters."

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

Giorgi: "The Gentleman moved for the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the previous question is passed. Mr. Pierce or Mr. Mugalian to close."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly to respond to some of the questions



that were raised and which I was not able to respond to. There's some talk about all of the money that this would cost. This... this Commission, if established, and if it does the job that I hope it does, would not only save this state hundreds of millions of dollars in hard economic dollars, but immeasurable in social costs to our state. The planning of our land resources, which are in supply ah.. to not have a price tag and \$50,000 is one of the greatest investments we could make if we could have some partial solution to these problems as a result of this Commission. Now this Bill... it is suggested that this Bill is going to impose certain things upon the people of this state, that it may impose big brotherism on us or impose regional planning. Now if ah... if all of you were listening or those who raised those questions were listening to what I said, or ah.. would have read the Bill and ah... the mere title suggests that this is a Study Commission. What this Commission would do would be report back to us the best more current research and analysis in this field. Then it would be up to us, those of us who are reelected to address ourselves to any Legislative Proposals that this Commission may have. One other point was made as to the ah.. provisions of this Bill. It's suggested that this Bill would create state regulation of flood plains or airport zoning regulations or port authorities. Ladies and Gentlemen, we already have that in this state. We have statewide flood controls zoning that was passed in 1971. We have airport zoning now. We have port authorities. The point is that we have so many authorities and regulations that no one knows what the proper function is of each agency."

Giorgi: "The question is shall House Bill 3103 pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no' and Representative Schlickman to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Illinois is great because of its natural resources. Great both agriculturally and industrially. We are fast realizing however, that this greatness is not guaranteed because our natural resources not not inexhaustible. Many many years ago, a President, Theodore Roosevelt, saw



the need for governmental action in the natural resource field. And out of his efforts and a Convention that he called, each of the states now has a Department of Conservation. And when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, there was developed a Model Zoning Enabling Act for the states. Today each of the states has a Zoning Enabling Act for its units of local government. Times are changing and new problems have developed. Our land, our natural resources are being abused. They are being mis-used. They're being lost in some cases forever. What this Bill does is to create at the state level, a Commission... a Study Commission to see what is happening and to get the views of those involved as to what should be done. This Commission should assist us in maintaining states rights. It should assist us in Illinois in solving our problem of meeting the challenges we have to insure that Illinois will continue to be great, that it will continue to have natural resources that presently exist and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to unduly repeat, but I'd like to state to the Sponsor of this Bill at ah... that when 357 was being considered..... I will hope that at time they'd be more generous in their support of that Bill because tries to do in some ways the same before it was amended out... which I had to do in order to try to get it out. But I would like to say that the concept is good and if we're going to do anything on a sensible basis, we have to study this. We're only going to make for a study and I think we should get on it because if we're going to have anything to do do anything constructively with the Legislature, we have to know what is going on when those Bills do come down the pike. There will be a lot of them coming down the road the next several years because land use is becoming a very important problem, not only on the local level but on the state level. If we're going to have the Zion Plant and the other electrical powers plants, they've got to be done on a state level rather than on a local level. I think that



we should support this Bill."

Giorgi: "Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I may explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Giorgi: "Continue."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, in explaining my vote, let me say that this problem is going to be studied. We have right now a Joint Committee.... Sub-Committee planned, between Cities and Villages and Counties and Townships Committees specifically directed towards this purpose. For instance, I had a Bill ah... a Senate Bill, 157, to create a Land Resources Study Commission and we put it in Counties and Townships and we put it in the Sub-Committee because we felt that we did not want to go ahead with another Commission. We felt that it should have the Legislators and Acting Sub-Committee and we are willing... as far as I'm concerned, to take in Environmental and Natural Resources if they also wish to participate in the Study Committee. And I think that we can do it on that basis, rather than creating another Commission. For that reason, I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Giorgi: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just quickly to explain my vote; it seems to me that fifteen or twenty years ago if some Representative had introduced ah... a Study Commission on Energy, it would have died of boredom. We would have yawned and we would have said that this really isn't critical and it's not really a crisis. Today, of course, we have a full page in our Digest which is energy this and energy that. And I think that this is the same kind of genre in this kind of Commission and this particular area of investigation. This is not for this year or next year, but this is for ah.. I think for a generation because it seems to me that ten or twelve or fifteen from now, there will be a crisis and we'll call it a crisis. And we'll all have creative solutions then, but it will be much much too late. This is the time for us to begin to do a little bit for our people and to do some-



thing for the next generation. This Bill will begin that. I think it is very important and very critical."

Giorgi: "Chairman Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I welcome Representative McMaster's statement, but let me tell you, it's the first time that anyone from Counties and Townships or Cities and Villages have tried in any way to communicate with the Committee on Environment Energy and Natural Resources. Now Mr. Mugalian came up with this Bill and this concept, which is approved by not only our Committee, but by the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriation is on Third Reading in the House to fund this Commission. It's before us... all segments of the public in Illinois will be represented on the Commission. The Municipal League will be represented. The Regional Planning Commissions will be represented. The Legislators will dominate the Commission. There will be public members on the Commission. We have a very well thought of concept of a full time Commission by Representative Mugalian and certainly the Land Resources Management Problem and Program is going to be with us for a long time, but every day.... every day now we're losing valuable open space, valuable land, valuable natural resources and I urge the Members of the House to give this concept the go ahead today and not wait until it's too late. And we'll continue to see all of our valuable open spaces ah... especially in the Metropolitan areas destroyed to the point where it's too late. It will be too late to reserve the natural resources of land especially in the great Metropolitan areas of our state and I urge passage of this very well thought of Commission concept of Representative Mugalian. And I vote 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, could I have just a little order, please? There's a lot of..."

Giorgi: "Give the Gentleman some order. We'd like to get this Roll Call completed."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that some of the red lights



might reconsider. You know, Representative Mugalian ah... it's true that he's a friend, but I've observed on how he votes on matters and I do not observe him to be a knee-jerk voter. I would hope that none of the lights up there indicate any ah... feeling about his general philosophy on matters. This is a specific Bill which deals with an area that's important to every one of us in our respected constituencies. Now we hear a lot of talk about state rights. Now let me just tell you what's happening in one area for those of you who are concerned about federal encroachment. Take a look at the impact of the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act. The Congress has passed a law saying that it's going to dictate land use of those ah.. shore lines adjacent to lakes which reside in states such as Lake Michigan. And I think the longer that the states ah... are inactive in this area, which is vital to them, ah.. the more federal encroachment that we are going to invite. Now if this were a Bill which were setting forth a bunch of principals upon which we had to vote, without the benefit of a study, I would be the first to say, let's go slow, but what we're looking here at ah.. is a request to study the matter. I'm sure that the Legislative Leaders on both sides of the aisle will appoint Members to this Study Commission who are going to reflect all of the philosophies that have to be protected in this House in order that a sober, well considered, well thought out study can be effected. It's only then that you will be voting on legislation. Only then after the Commission has reported to you that you will be considering the Legislative recommendation, but to indicate before hand a disposition against recommendations which you haven't yet seen would seem to me to be premature to say the least. I think that we want to look at this land use question, urbanization is certainly one problem. For those of you who live in suburban areas or live in agricultre areas, the question of how those areas will be developed is important in terms of your tax base... important to the tax base of the state. Future use of open land is important to all of us, but it would seem to me most important, if you want



to avoid the federal government telling you how you're going to zone and plan and do everthing else for you land, it would seem to me that you would consider authorizing a study. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been here eight terms. I've seen studies considered for butterflies. Certainly you can authorize a study for an issue of this magnitude. I really ask for an affirmative vote here. This Gentleman has not asked too much of the General Assembly. Let's give him a chance to do the kind of job that I know can be done."

Giorgi: "Ms. Reed. Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'present' vote, I'd like to refer to remarks made by the Chairman of the Energy Natural Resources Committee. I serve on that Committee and I also serve on the Sub-Committee appointed by Cities and Villages, Counties and Townships to study this problem. It was pointed out at the time that this Committee Bill came out to Representative Mugalian that the Sub-Committees were in existence and for that reason, I am voting 'present'."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ms. Satterthwaite, do you want to explain you vote?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the message I was planning to give was given very ably by one of the other Representatives ahead of me except that I would like to emphasize to the red lights in front of the names of people in rural areas, that the farm bureau and many of the other agriculturally oriented societies who have traditionally been opposed to land use planning as an encroachment upon their rights are now taking another point of view. And I remember that last year the Legislative Chairman for the farm bureau spoke to the farm bureau in Champaign County urging them to reconsider on the basis that if we do not have state plans for land use, we will end up having federal plans for land use. And I think that the agricultural community is now far more willing to accept a state land use plan on a basis of giving more local control, more local input that they would have if we had a federal law imposed upon us. On that basis, I would



like to support this Legislation and hope that some of those red lights from the rural areas will change quickly to green."

Gjorgi: "Mr. Borchers. Quickly, please."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, ah.. I come from a rural area and I can tell you that we have zoning boards of our own. And all this Bill is is at the foot of the door of a bureaucracy. A bureaucrat from Springfield and then in due time a bureaucrat from Washington, who does not know the land in Macon County or Christian or Shelby, who does ah.... will be telling us what to do with our land. Those lands include ah.. bottom lands, the wet lands, so to speak and our soybean fields, our corn fields, our forest and everything that we have. We are perfectly capable in my areas and speaking for my people, to make decisions of our own without some bureaucrat in Springfield having the right of domain over us and telling us what we can do with this acre and that acre. And I for one, as a land owner, have no intentions of supporting such a beginning of such a rule. So vote 'no'."

Gjorgi: "Representative Skinner, ah.. could you confine it to about ten seconds?"

Skinner: "Like many others in this House, I probably can vote for this, but I'm afraid that I have a fear that has been gendered by a very real lack of consideration by interests in my area on something called the Regional Transportation Authority. Now I can't take the Democrats back to the Republican Caucus when Representative Blair explained the R.T.A. Bill, but I can sure take the Republicans back. Do you remember what he said when the R.T.A. passed? Can we offer Amendments? Speaker Blair said, 'Sure, but we're not going to accept any'. Now I would like to make darn sure that the people who are on this Commission are not the people that are ah.. if you will, if I can put this on the political spectrum.... that are on the left wing of this issue and the people on the right wing of the issue ah.. are not adequately represented. And I don't think that's the make-up of this Commission as it is now ah... guarantees that. You have to have people representing the farmer, not just



the Department of Agriculture. You need people representing honest to God farmers. You need people representing environmentalists and God knows if anybody is going to be over represented on this Commission, they are going to be over represented on this Commission. And you need somebody that knows about property taxes. Well, Representative Mugalian knows about property taxes, but given his success on getting on Commissions in the past, I'm not at all sure that he is even going to get on this Commission if it passes. Now I think we oughta pull it back and I think we oughta put on the type of guarantees of representation that will make sure that the Leadership of this House and of that Senate has to put on the type of people that can come out with a reasonable solution with some chance of passing."

Giorgi: "The last speaker, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, I would like to say that I would like to know more about the land in Macon County and Shelby County and Christian County and all of these other counties. I think that we in the state level ought to know all about the precious uses of land that ah... that seemingly has deminished and ah... involved in urban spraul and what have you. You know, Perry Como used to warble this song very loudly, "The Best Things In Life Are Free." And I don't know if we realize that in these Halls, but it seems like the best things in life aren't free. It cost money to do something about air pollution and water pollution in land use. And somehow if we can look to the next generation and do something in these areas to conserve our land ah.. perhaps the only stable commodity left in this state. And I for one suggest that this is merely a Study Commission. I find that we don't heed good Study Commissions and I find that shouldn't be concerned about the make-up of this kind of Study Commission as long as it has the kind of expertise that knows all of the complex facets that making the problem of the appropriate land use in Illinois. So in closing ah.. I heard a definition this morning about ah.. something which goes like this. A politician looks to the next election. The stateman looks to the next generation. Not



that we can hope for very much in this Bill because it's only a Study Commission, but it leads us to hope to look into the next generation and to which way are we going to go in the area of stopping this bad land use situation we have in Illinois and which way are going to go to ah.. to handle land waste and all of the incumbent problems therewith."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this there are 89 votes and 66 'nays' and ah... Mr. Hudson, for what reason do you rise?"

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the reason ah..to ask for a verification of the Roll."

Giorgi: "Mr. Mugalian, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mugalian: "May I have a poll of the absentees, Mr. Speaker?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Clerk, will you poll the absentees?"

Jack O'Brien: "Brandt, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fleck, Garmisa, Giglio, Hirschfeld, Huff, Madison, ..."

Giorgi: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would you vote me 'aye', please?"

Giorgi: "Madison, 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "McPartlin, Shea, and Terzich."

Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian ah... Mr. Hudson, do you persist in you verification?"

Hudson: "Oh, sure."

Giorgi: "O'kay, two Bills are involved. House Bill 339 and House Bill 3103. Is that correct? Proceed with with the verification, Mr. Clerk ah.. unless Mr. Mugalian has receded from his position. Are you going to continue with the Roll Call for verification?"

Mugalian: "I didn't ask for the verification."

Giorgi: "Mr. Hudson did, but you have 90 votes."

Mugalian: "No, I'd like to go ahead, please."

Giorgi: "Go ahead, Mr. hudson... I mean, Mr. Clerk. Proceed with the verification."

Jack O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, J.M. Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman,



Bluthardt, Bradley, Byers, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Capuzi, Catania, Chapman, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, Deuster, DiPrima, Downs, Duff, Dyer,"

Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Skinner, for what reason do you rise?"

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

Giorgi: "How is Mr. Skinner recorded?"

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

Skinner: "Even though I don't have a hell of a lot trust in the State Senate, I'll vote 'aye'."

Giorgi: "He votes 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Fennessey, Friedland, Gaines, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giorgi, Greiman, Griesheimer, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Katz, Kelly, Kempiners, Kozubowski, Kucharski, LaFleur, Laurino, Leinenweber, Lucco, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McGrew, McLendon, Merlo, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Palmer, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Reed, Rose, Sangmeister, Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schneider, Schraeder, Sharp, Skinner, Stearney, Stone, Stubblefield, Telcser, Tuerk, VanDuyne, Wall, Washington, Willer, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

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

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Giorgi: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Hirschfeld: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Giorgi: "Vote Hirschfeld 'aye'. Representative Bradley, for what reason do you rise?"

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before they start verifying, I rise for the purpose of an announcement and a very special announcement it is, I believe. Representative VonBoeckman's mother and father are here with us today and they're sitting directly over the Speaker in the Speaker's Gallery and I wish they would arise and be recognized along with Jim's wife, Norma."



Giorgi: "Representative McClain."

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

I believe I am recorded as 'no' and I would like to change my vote to 'aye' of anticipation of Gale Schisler being on the Commission."

Giorgi: "Mr. McClain wants to be recorded as voting 'aye' with the stipulation that Schlisler is on the Commission. Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, would it be out of order to ask you what the vote is now ah.. just prior to starting the Roll."

Giorgi: "93 'ayes'."

Hudson: "93, ah..."

Giorgi: "I'm sorry... Mr. McCourt, for what reason do you rise?"

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is a peoples Bill so change me to 'aye' from 'no'."

Giorgi: "From 'no' to 'aye', Mr. McCourt?"

McCourt: "Correct."

Giorgi: "From 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Boyle, for what reason do you rise?"

Boyle: "Change me from 'present' to 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Representative Boyle votes 'aye'. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, change me from voting 'present' to voting 'yes'."

Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Farley, for what reason do you rise?"

Farley: "How am I recorded?"

Giorgi: "How is Representative Farelly recorded?"

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

Farley: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Giorgi: "Vote Representative Farley 'aye'. This is now... Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Giorgi: "How is Representative Mautino recorded?"

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

Mautino: "Please change that to 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Change Mautino from 'no' to 'aye'. How many does that make now? Mr. Hudson, there are 98 'aye' votes. Mr. Hudson.... Repre-



sentative Hudson...."

Hudson: "I'm hanging in there, Mr. Speaker."

Giorgi: "98 'aye' votes."

Hudson: "Yes. That's a good round figure."

Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Hudson. Mr. Kornowicz, for what reason do you rise?"

Kornowicz: "How am I recorded there ah..?"

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

Kornowicz: "Make it 'yes'."

Giorgi: "Mr. Kownowitz votes 'aye'. Time out for a meeting. Representative Londrigan, for what reason do you rise?"

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm against these Commission Bills, but this obviously will have enough votes and so to get on with our business ah... I would hope that we wouldn't have a verification. And I will change from 'no' to 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Londrigan from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Brandt. How is Representative Brandt recorded?"

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

Brandt: "Ah... vote me 'aye'."

Giorgi: "Mr. Brandt votes 'aye'. What's the new total, Mr. Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Hudson, 100 'aye'."

Hudson: "Are there any more that want to vote 'yes', Mr. Speaker?"

Giorgi: "Are there any more that want to vote 'yes'... Mr. Hudson asks?"

Hudson: "I want them all to get a chance to get on."

Giorgi: "There's none left, Mr. Hudson. Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when one must yield and I think this is the time. So I withdraw my request for a verification in the interest of the time of this General Assembly. And I thank you."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Hudson. In that event, House Bill 339 and House Bill 3103 having received 100 'aye' votes, ah... is that right, Mr. Clerk? 100 'aye' votes and 61 'nay' votes ah... any present? And 8 'present' and these two Bills having received the constitutional majority are hereby declared passed. Representative Holewinski on House Bill 3104. Are you ready to go with that? We'll



continuing right on down the line on the page. Mr. Clerk, will you read House Bill 3104?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3104. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Health Maintenance Organization Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3104 is a Committee Bill from the Committee on Human Resources. It is the substitute Bill for House Bill 1928, which was Sponsored by Representative Lundy. We reported it out ah.. 21 to 0 and I would defer to Representative Lundy for an explanation of the Bill and ah.. for him to answer questions."

Giorgi: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1928 ah... the predecessor of this substitute Committee Bill made ah... three or four technical changes in the Health Maintenance Organization Act which the General Assembly passed last year. I had not intended to attempt to make a Committee Bill out of 1928, but the Departments of Insurance and Public Health, which are currently in the process of issuing regulations to implement the H.M.O. Act ah.. informed me that they felt the Bill was necessary in order for them to go forward with their regulations. The changes are technical. The only substantive change is really ah... is ah.. require that participation of enrollees in H.M.O. ah.. in part of the grievance ah.. processing mechanism and the certain changes in the reserve requirements for H.M.O.'s. I would be glad to answer any questions. The Bill did come out originally ah.. unanimously from the Executive Committee and again unanimously from the Human Resources Committee. I ask for a favorable vote."

Giorgi: "Any further discussion? The question is shall House Bill 3104 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Punch Gene Barnes 'aye' button there. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question. there are 125 'ayes' and 2 'nays' and 3 voting 'present' and Grotberg, 'aye', Stubblefield, 'aye'.... this Bill



having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bills, Third Reading. 3105."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3105. A Bill for an Act to amend the Commission on the Status of Women. Third Reading of the Bill."

Giorgi: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3105 is a Human Resources Committee Bill unanimously recommended by the Committee. What it does is to reduce from the current twelve member quorum out of sixteen members of the Commission ah.. to a nine member quorum. It also reduces from the current ten out of sixteen required to required to render a determination or decision ah.. to eight members of the Commission required for that purpose. It further provides that the Commission shall maintain an office and it also impowers the Commission to accept funds from other sources ah.. a power which is now in the statutes ah... seven other Commissions in similar, if not identical language, and I do ask for your support of this legislation, which ah.. was caught in the crunch on May 23rd. The Bill ah.. it was presented just before that date ah.. did have subpoena power for the Commission. That has been removed and this no longer has that power in the Committee Bill 3105."

Giorgi: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "I think that Susan just answered. The subpoena power has been removed?"

Catania: "That's correct. There's no subpoena power whatsoever in this Bill."

Kosinski: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Any further discussion? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another Commission Bill and although we've done a lot of debating about the creation of Commissions, we have an example here of what happens after Commissions have been around awhile. They are constitently making efforts to expand and to grow and ah... there's only one reservation I have about this Commission. If you read the language of this Bill very carefully, you'll find that



unlike what the Sponsor suggested, there's some language that this Commission can receive money from ah.. virtually any source. Ah... there is only one other Commission that has this exact language and about the seventy. And I think the dangers when you have a Commission that is involved in a social movement and very socially active Commission, that they could under this Bill... under this Amendment, receive source money from Playboy Magazine, from E.R.A. Central, from the Communists Party, from anybody. And I think that if we are going to have a Commission of the General Assembly, we oughta fund it ourselve and fund it properly as I believe that we have done. In my case, I've Co-Sponsored Legislation, as many of you have, to increase the appropriation, but I think it's very dangerous if we allow outside sources to just come in and ah.. you might say, take over a Commission of this General Assembly in a financial way. I offered

Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Deuster. Ms. Catania is raising a point of order."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, my point is that yesterday, I believe it was, when this Gentleman spoke on this matter, he said what he just said now, that is that only one other Commission has the power to accept funds from other sources. He said that he got this information from the Legislative Council. I have since then checked with the Legislative Council and I now have in my hand copies of the statutes of seven other Commissions that have the powers to accept funds from other sources. I suggest that he is deliberately attempting to mislead this Body with that information. And I suggest that he confine himself to information which he has certified as being correct."

Giorgi: "Mr. Deuster, I think the point is well taken."

Deuster: "Well, the point is ejection into my debate and I think if the gentle Lady will read those Commissions, she'll find that there is only one that has the language from any other reputable source. And I was about to say on Second Reading, that it's my feeling that a responsible Legislator should try and out a Bill in shape that it can be supported. I think we had a majority voice vote in support



of striking that objectionable language. However, we had a very fast gavel by a Gentleman who is not now in the Chair. I think the Bill is deficient and I would urge you to vote against it. There's some parts of the Bill that may be helpful to the Commission, but this is a serious deficiency and I think it ought to be put on postponed consideration so it could be taken back to Second Reading and cured the way that ah.. the Amendment offered to cure it. I think it is very dangerous to give our Commissions the run away financial power to accept money from any other source. And when this Bill came up ah.. it has about nine lives, the Sponsor admitted ah.. or refused to answer whether she thought Playboy Magazine or E.R.A. were reputable sources. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Giorgi: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Lady would yield for two questions?"

Giorgi: "She indicates she will."

Bradley: "I see in the synopsis that you're reducing the number needed for a quorum from twelve to nine and changes from ten members to eight members needed to make a decision by the Commission. Have you also reduced in Commission numbers?"

Catania: "No, Representative Bradley. The reason we're asking for this reduction is ah.. as you probably know, it's very difficult to get twelve of sixteen Commissioners who are scattered around the state into one place at any given time for a meeting. I know of no other Commission that has this extraordinary requirement for a quorum. We are asking for one more than half of the membership of the Commission, that is nine of the sixteen members as a quorum."

Bradley: "O'kay, well then my second question is what was the number of your bill before ah.. you had ah... as I recall ah... I think we debated this question before with another House Bill number and what was the result of that debate?"

Catania: "As I indicated, Representative Bradley, ah.. this is a substitute for House Bill 1437 however, that Bill had subpoena power. We did discuss the Bill with subpoena power. I have now asked the



Human Resources Committee to remove subpoena power, which that Committee has done. This Committee Bill has no subpoena power whatsoever. That seemed to be the point which was ah... a problem for most of the Members who were not in favor of the Bill before."

Bradley: "Well, that Bill was defeated then?"

Catania: "It was placed on postponed consideration with subpoena power in it."

Bradley: "All right. Thank you, very much."

Giorgi: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Legislation. The Sponsor has amended this Bill on a couple of occasions and I would like to remind Representative Deuster that two of those Amendments were his and he had an opportunity to offer an Amendment yesterday and lost. So I feel that he doesn't really should have an objection at this time. And I would ask for your favorable vote."

Giorgi: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to House Bill 3105 for several reasons. One, there's a provision in the Bill which requires that the Commission shall maintain offices for the transaction of business in any city or cities in the State of Illinois. Now ah.. that was amended from 'may' to 'shall' so we're now mandating the maintaining of offices for this Commission throughout the State of Illinois. Now I caution the Members because if you can remember this Commission has gone from a somewhat modest appropriation under ah.. previous legislative leaders to now ah.. for the first time this Session we came in for a deficiency appropriation. Now with the mandating of offices throughout the state ah.. the question of money, I think, comes of a prom ah... of prominence to the Members of the General Assembly in view of the fiscal situation in the state. I would also like to remind the Members that it was from this Commission ah.. that some 81 Bills were submitted to the House that tied up ah.. not only several Committees of this House or one Committee of this House for some time, but also this General Assembly for a considerable



amount time and the additional powers and the mandating of offices I think are just a dangerous precedence and I think they are uncalled for at this time. And this Bill should receive the same result as its predecessor did, which is at the best postponed consideration. And I request a 'no' vote on it."

Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not satisfied with everything that's in this Bill. However, I'm most apprecitive of the Sponsor having amended the Bill to provide that the examination of Illinois law will be with respect to equal protection under the Constitution, which is the way the Constitution reads. The original Bill provided for examination of Illinois without respect to quality of rights under the Constitution, which the Constitution did not provide. So I say ah.. I am appreciate of the Sponsor for having made that change consistent with the Constitution in the 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution and therefore I shall vote for it."

Giorgi: "Catania to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do appreciate the observations of the last speaker. I would like to add that we have further amended this Bill on think on at least five separate occasions in an attempt to meet the reasonable requests of any Members of this Body who felt that ah.. some language presented any kind of a problem in the Bill. Originally we had asked for a quorum of eight of the sixteen members and we amended that up to nine and so forth. We also amended it... I would point out to the Gentleman from Arlington Heights ah.. we amended it ah... I'm sorry, you're from Hoffman Estates, ah.. we amended it to provide that the Commission shall maintain an office, not offices, but just one office which we currently do have. We've always had one in the home of the Executive Secretary of the Commission. I would point out to the Gentleman who seemed so preoccupied with Playboy Magazine, that this has never come up at a Commission Meeting and I don't expect that it would. Ah... this seems to be something that exists entirely in his mind and doesn't seem to trouble any



Commissioners. I would further point out that ah.. at least seven other Commissions do have the power to accept fund from outside sources. This Bill was unanimously recommended by the Human Resources Committee and I do ask for your support."

Giorgi: "The question is shall House Bill 3105 pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Katz."

Katz: "A good deal of attention has been directed to Commissioners that receive funds as this Commission does. I would want to state that the Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly has such a provision ten years ago. There's nothing new about it. And they did, in fact, receive funds and carried on some of its activities as a result of such funds. So this is not a unique provision and that is one of the reasons that I am voting for the bill."

Giorgi: "Any ah.. have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 108 'ayes' and 22 'nays' and 2 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 91."

Jack O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich in the Chair."

Matijevich: "Senate Bill 91."

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

Matijevich: "Representative Rayson. Representative Rayson is not on the floor. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 101."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 101, Greiman. A Bill..."

Matijevich: "Representative Greiman ah.. take that out of the record. Senate Bill 223."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 223, Gene Hoffman. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. Senate



Bill 223 is ah.. in a sense ah... a companion Bill to House Bill 598, which is now on ah.. Third Reading in the Senate. And the Digest is correct when it says that it provides that when the Department assists in a placement of a person in a licensed private facility, the cost of the family of the person in the private facility shall be no more than the cost would be if the person were in a Department Facility. We've developed a schedule which is included in House Bill 598. Ah... Senate Bill 223 also provides that the Department shall from time to time determine a uniform maximum rate based on the actual cost of treatment, maintenance or residence of a person in a private facility. And as ah... it reemphasizes the fact that the Department has the authority to determine ah.. eligibility for placement of persons in private facilities. In Committee ah.. we attached an Amendment ah.. which indicated that ah.. nothing in this Session would prohibit a person, if they wish, to contribute more to a private facility than the amount ah.. required, but that was a individual decision. We did want to make it clear that ah.. they could do that. And I would ask for your support of Senate Bill 223."

Matijevich: "Are there any questions to the Sponsor? The question is shall Senate Bill 223 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 137 voting 'aye' and none voting 'nay' and 4 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 234."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 234. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Occupational Disease Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House to hear 235 also."

Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave? He has leave. Proceed."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 235. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have no intentions of speaking at any length on these two pieces of legislation. They have been gone over very thoroughly...."



Matijevich: "Just a minute. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman arise?"

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "What is your point?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, our rules provide that when the Speaker leaves one order of business and goes to another order of business, which is within the Speaker's discretion... when he returns to the original order of business, he must go back where he left off. Now yesterday we were at the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading. We were much farther beyond Senate Bill 234, ah.. by my recollection."

Matijevich: "Ah... not according to my recollection, but I'll check with the Parliamentarian. I understand.... ah.. Representative Barnes on that question."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, ah..yesterday ah... and I checked the Calendar intentionally to mark exactly where we did stop and where we did stop, for the Gentleman's edification was on Senate Bill 221 and the next Bill in line of order would have been Senate Bill 234."

Matijevich: "I believe you're right, but we'll ah.... Representative Schlickman on that point."

Schlickman: "The Gentleman is right and I withdraw my objection."

Matijevich: "Thank you. Representative Hill to proceed."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 234 is amending the Workman's Occupational Disease Act and Senate Bill 235 is amending the Workman's Compensation Act. Many of the National Commission recommendations are in this particular piece of Legislation. I'd like to point out to you that if we don't catch up to those recommendations you can feel well assured that the federal government is going to come in here and direct, from the federal level, our Workman's Compensation Law and our Occupation Disease Act. And I don't believe that any of us sitting on this floor want to see that happen. It's much better under the control of the State of Illinois than the federal government, as far as I'm concerned. And I would appreciate very much an 'aye' vote on these two pieces of Legislation."

Matijevich: "Is there any discussion? Representative.... the Gentleman



Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll attempt to be as brief as possible, but frankly I don't know how we can be that brief in opposition to these Bills ah.... as the Sponsor is ah... as he proposed passage. First of all, he says that this encompasses the recommendation of the Nation Commission. First of all, the National Commission did make a number of recommendations and this Body had an opportunity to ah..."

Matijevich: "Excuse me, Representative Tuerk. Could I interrupt? There has been permission to film ah.. so I did want the House do be aware of that. Proceed, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "The Labor and Commerce Committee did have an opportunity to act on a Bill which would have implemented the nineteen recommendations that the National Commission so ah.. ah.. recommended in its report. Now what 234 and 235 do is go much beyond the National Commission's recommendation. And what these Bills will eventually do, upon passage ah.. if they do pass and become law, would be to increase cost and benefits to the extent.... extraordinary increases without giving any relief on the procedural matters, which the Commission strongly recommends that any state in implementing the Workman's Comp' ah... directives or recommendations ah.. whichever way you want to interpret them, that this Bill goes ah... these Bills go much beyond that particular point. Now we had much testimony in Committee in opposition on these Bills from particularly small business people who cited chapter and verse of what these Bills are going to do to their Workman's Comp' premium costs. At the outset, it will increase the cost by 50%. Now beyond that, it's going to increase the cost much higher and one witness estimated that in the first year, it's going to double his costs and in the second year it would quadruple his costs. Now there's one provision particularly in Senate Bill 234 that goes much beyond what ah.. I think this Body would ah.. want to pass ah.. and that is ah.. in the area of the Occupation Disease Act, where a person can have a common cold and report to work and have that aggravated within the ah.. confines of his work experience and he could be ah.. subject to Workman's Comp' benefits. Now I submit to you ah... as we talked about



it the other day in the Amendment stage, that this was not the intent of Workman's Comp! Laws. I submit that it's a bad practice. It's totally illogical and should not be accepted. So on that one point and that one point alone, Senate Bill 234 should be rejected. Now there are other bad features of Senate Bill 234 and perhaps other Speakers will cover some of those points, but on 235 ah.. what 235 would do is broaden the definitions of employer, employee, and hazardous undertaking. It would increase the time in which an employee can apply for compensation. It changes the provisions regarding benefits to an employees relatives and dependent. It changes the provisions regarding payment of medical services and records. It changes compensation provisions for temporary total incapacity, physical impairment, loss of members and permanent total disability. And many of you recall that that was a subject of an Amendment that I attempted to attach to this Bill to keep the ah.. temporary total and permanent total disability in the present form of the law. Senate Bill 235 permits the Industrial Commission to assess attorney's fees and costs against the employer in many cases. What Senate Bill 235 does, as I mentioned a moment ago, that it does make massive changes in the Workman's Compensation Act that will greatly increase the cost without doing a thing about the administrative problems inherent in the process. As I said, this goes much beyond the National Commission recommendation and it removes the present benefit system that is based on graduated benefit scales for a series of weeks and replaces it with a system wherein the employee receives 2/3rds of his average weekly wage up to a maximum of ah.."

Matijevich: "Mr. Tuerk, will you bring your remarks to a close? You've run out of time."

Tuerk: "I was just about to do that in making this point that it makes it 2/3rds of the average weekly wage up to that maximum of 2/3rds of the average weekly wage in manufacturing. By 1980 the maximum goes up to 200% of the average weekly wage. I submit to you that we attempted to amend these two Bills the other day to make some semblance of sanity structure of the two Bills and had we been successful, I could have supported the Bills, but in the way they are today, I would have



to urge your opposition for both 234 and 235."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly urge your support of this Bill and would like to point out what I feel are some discrepancies in my good friend and well respected colleague, Mr. Tuerk's commentaries. In the first place, he discusses that one of the problems with these Bills is that even though they do adopt a benefit by the National Commission ah.. as recommended by them, they do not change the procedure. Well, I would only say that the procedure that we have in the State of Illinois has worked very well for many years in this area. And it hasn't been perfect, but one reason that it hasn't been is it was dictated to us by the employers of the State of Illinois under the Agreed Bill Process. And what procedure we had, the employers brought here and it's funny that they now complain about it and I'm surprised that Mr. Tuerk is now complaining about the procedure that the employers brought to us. When we talk about this doubling the cost of the small employers of the state, I think that someone is trying to use the small employers of the state as a whipping boy because this just is not true. Now the Commission that made this study and reported how it would increase the costs was the Commission ah.. on which was appointed and on which President Nixon appointed, and I don't think President Nixon sold out to labor in making this study. And it shows that the increase in cost will not exceed 26% after ah... including the benefits that are in this package through 1980. Now if this is correct, it's ridiculous to say that those costs will be doubled next year and quadrupled after that because it is not born out by the study made by the National Commission appointed by President Nixon. Now also, ah.. in that Commission, if a small employer's cost double or quadruples because of these benefits, he's being ripped off... not by this Bill and not by this Legislature, but he's being ripped off by his insurance carrier because compensation benefits are computed on the basis of experience. How many losses you have and in an area of small business like we're talking about and it's been thrown around and it's been bandied about... the retailer ah... things of this kind, do not have tremendous losses or have hardly



losses in the comp' area. So if they're getting ripped off as being ripped off by their carries ah.. who are not properly underwriting their losses are underwriting their insurance policies because the underwriting, if it's done properly, will apply only to the losses that occurs in that industry and it's one of the lowest there is in the retail and the other areas that'll be covered ah.. is one of the lowest in the country. And how in the world their costs could quadruple, is beyond belief and beyond imagination. When we talk about the common, a man going to work with a common cold, and coming out under the Occupational Disease Act with an agravation of having a claim, I tell you ah.. if you believe that ah..... let me point out to you that it's kinda like me standing here and trying to tell you about the man who lost his leg and filed his claim 366 days after his last temporary total benefits was paid and was denied any coverage and his children suffered the rest of their lives because he couldn't get work. Now that's the kind of a scare thing I could talk about, but I don't think that's fair and I'm not going to do it, but I don't think it's fair to talk about a common cold getting agravated and a man getting compensation. We know that there's no arbitrator in this state, no court in this state, no Industrial Commission that will ever function in this state, that would give such an award. When we talk about attorney fees and costs being assessed against the employer in many cases, what cases? Only the cases where the employer wrongfully refuses to award... to award any temporary benefits to the employee who was injured. Only in the cases where the employer was derelict in correcting a deficiency in his machinery and equipment that he knew very well....."

Matijevich: "Mr. Calvo, being your remarks to a close."

Calvo: "I certainly will, Sir. I'm just doing that. Would ah.... he knew very well from the fact that other people had lost their hands or their arms, was defective and should have been replaced. Certainly the employer should bare those expenses and not the widows and orphans of these employees. I strongly urge your support of these Bills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "From Cook, the Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh."



Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what concerns me most about this Bill and the next Bill is the fact that it changes the philosophy with respect to Workman's Compensation. And it expands the idea that workmen will be cared for when they are injured on the job and this goes to injuries that are not necessarily job related. When we do that, we place business in a position of taking care of medical payments and establishing a medical plan or a retirement plan not related to age. Now I suggest to you that this is a new philosophy, it's different, it's not in keeping with our free enterprise system and shouldn't be. What disturbs me also is what the Gentleman... the Sponsor of the Bill said about ah.. 'we better get this done or the federal government is going to get in here and do it for us'. Well, if I suggest to you that if it's bad, let them get in and do it for us. They've done other things for us. They've threatened other things upon us. They've said that if we don't establish automobile shops for testing automobiles, then they'll withhold federal funds for highways. Well, they haven't done that yet. I suppose because they don't have the nerve. We knuckled under and voted for a fifty-five mile per hour speed limit, as did all of the other states, and I don't think there is a person in here who hasn't violated that law within the last week because it's unreasonable, it's unrealistic. Well, we've got something here that's unreasonable and unrealistic also. And if the federal government wants to place this upon us, if they want socialism, then let them be responsible. Let's not help them with it. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Richard Mulcahey. No, ah.. wait.... from Winnebago, the Assistant ah.. the Minority Whip, Tim Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition against House Bill ah.. Senate Bills 234 and 235. My opposition to this legislation beyond the ah...good explanation of why this legislation should not be enacted by Representative Tuerk and Walsh is the untimeliness of passing this legislation at this particular time. Last year in Illinois, 6.3% decrease in the number of business and industries that left the State of Illinois. 30,000,000



permanent jobs left the State of Illinois because the business could find some other state or some other place where the economic opportunities were greater than the State of Illinois. By the passage of this legislation, Illinois will have ah.. by far, one of the most liberal and far reaching Workman's Compensation Acts in the state. And I say to you today, in reflecting upon the economic status of the State of Illinois, we are in serious economic times. Last week, the Governor of the State of Illinois, before us, indicated the serious problem. He was asking the Legislature to cut back on the appropriations to state government and he articulated the view that business and industry in the State of Illinois were also in trouble. And I say to you with the high unemployment in the State of Illinois... the number of businesses that are in economic distress, this is not the time for the General Assembly to increase the cost of doing business in the State of Illinois by 50% the first year and 100% the second year in the increase in unemployment compensation benefits to the people of this state. If we want Illinois to become an economic dessert, then the Legislature should pass these two Senate Bills, but if we are to maintain a free enterprise system in the State of Illinois if we are to attract new business and industry to the State of Illinois to give people jobs and opportunities to earn their own living, then we should try to encourage businesses to stay, not drive it out. And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I say that Senate Bills 234 and 235 are untimely at the least and should receive a 'no' vote today by this House."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative George Ray Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Senate Bills 234 and 235 because it seems to me that these Bills ah.. properly labled should be called the devastating duo ah... or the disasterous duo if you will as far as Illinois business in concerned. The two of these Bills are the real double-whamy... the old one-two; together they constitute precisely that. Representative Simms has already eluded as to what can happen and what may happen, but it seems to me that if this Bill should pass... it can discourage business in Illinois and put some Illinois businesses



down and out from the result of the old one-two through 234 and 235. And this done at the precise time that we should be giving Illinois business a pat on the back, but what we seem to be doing is giving it a kick in the seat of the pants. Current laws certainly are not perfect in this area and perhaps they should be reviewed, but it's been suggested here today that we have something that reflects the wishes of the Nation Commission. Well, perhaps some aspects of these Bills do reflect the wishes of the National Commission, but they go way beyond that and they certainly constitute no compromise between labor and business in the State of Illinois. Business had very little, if any input into this. They go way beyond the benefit levels in coverage proposed drastically increased the employers cost, as Representative Tuerk ah.. has so ably told you, to a point.... they increase the cost to a point which will hender... keeping business in Illinois, hender the maintenance of business in Illinois to say nothing about ah... let alone expand the business roles in this state. This Bill more than doubles the benefits. The immediate premiums will increase to almost 50% in the first year, 100% in the second year... that is by July 1, 1976 and the escalating cost of doing business will certainly tend to drive business out of this state. Representative Simms mentioned a figure, I will mention another figure. It is said that over the recent five to ten years the state has lost 6.2% of jobs to business moved to other states. That represents 6.2 million jobs losed to businesses in other states and I can only suggest that Bills of this kind will excellerate this trend. These two Bills will be hard on small business. They will be very difficult on larger businesses and it seems to me, my colleagues, that what our people want and are crying for today are more jobs. They're not looking for handouts in the way of Workman's Compensation or other. They want jobs and the only way to get jobs is to encourage business in this state. Business as we know is already depressed, but here comes these two Bills and it seems to me that the two Bills will go a long way to nulifying the gains that we're already..... the gains that are in a small way...."

Matijevich: "Mr. Hudson, will you bring your remarks to a close?"

Hudson: "I am concluding, Mr. Speaker, with urging my colleagues, for



these reasons and others mentioned by prior speakers, to vote 'no' on this disasterous, devastating duo... 234 and 235."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Joseph Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in this House knows how they're going to vote on 234 and 235 and I move the previous question."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All in favor say 'aye' and the opposed 'no' and the previous question prevails. To close, Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and the House, I'm not going to talk long about this particular subject. I certainly agree with Representative Ebbesen, that the people fully understand what's in these two Bills. One thing I would like say though is the elimination of the sixty-four weeks in regards to someone who's injured in a factory. I don't know if the individual who mentioned that particular subject realizes that many people in the State of Illinois end up going on welfare because those payments stop and the same people that complain about this are the same people that complain about the high welfare payments in the State of Illinois. This certainly would eliminate some of those payments in this particular area. I would appreciate very much an 'aye' vote."

Matijevich: "The question is shall Senate Bills 234 and 235 pass. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Matijevich, 'aye'. Representative Neff, are you arising for an explanation of vote?"

Neff: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.... yes.... I would like to explain my vote on ah... Bills such as this. I think that we've all got to realize what we're doing to the State of Illinois and I hope every Member realizes this. This will no doubt, as been brought out here, will drive business away besides close up many small business that we have today. Right at this time we have a problem with creating labor jobs and this will ah.. hurt instead of help the people that we're trying to help. We'll have less employment and therefore what we're doing here is just turning around and say we're helping people ah.. and we're really hurting those people. Just for an example, ah..



a small retailer with twenty-five employees in the State of Illinois which today pays \$3333. This would jump him up to \$11,300. This is a hike of more than \$8,000. And this small retailer... if he started out to ah... ah... increase which his average income of retailers and business in the State of Illinois, we must keep in mind, is only 4%. This means that this small retailer would have to do \$200,000 worth ah.. more of business. There are two things that's going to happen. Either this small retailer is going to close up and go out of business or else ah.. he's going to have to move out of the state and also ah.. this causes inflation. This is another big thing that we want to keep in mind when we force these prices be raised by retailers and manufactures and so forth, they either raise the price or go out of business. It's just that simple in the free enterprise system. Therefore I would hope that we would have more 'no' votes on this."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to explain my vote on this and also ask leave to divide my vote ah.. even though we are hearing these Bills jointly. Many of you in this Chamber probably have not had the opportunity of representing a respondent in a Workman's Compensation Claim. Although our party seems to be committed to opposing this type of legislation, I want you to know that the labor has been consistently taken advantaged of in the State of Illinois. To this day, ah.. to you awes who don't practice before Workman's Compensation Board, I would strongly suggest that you get up there and check it out. You'll find that a person with a work related injury ah.. when it is contested are often times made to wait longer than you have to wait for a personal injury action to be heard in Circuit Court in Cook County, then they get a pittance for the amount of their injury. Now as a practical matter, there has not been a material change in the Workman's Compensation Law in the State of Illinois, excpet on two occasions, since about 1938. Now there does need to be some revision. When you see a company doctor sign 'no injury' on a man who can't straighten up and walk, you have to ask yourself, 'Is the provision that a company doctor is that correct?



Is it really good for the laboring people?' In today's Chicago Tribune there's a quite a good article on the editorial page by Mr. Berglin where he reviews the vast change in the business atmosphere in Illinois. And he points out the number of business that are leaving Illinois, but don't kid yourself; it's not Workman's Compensation, it's the abominable tax situation which we have imposed on business. And I hope those same people that were voting for this Bill, who represent labor interests, will do something to void the taxes or at least substantially reduce them on business in the future. Under these circumstances I would ask the Speaker to vote 'aye' on 235 and 'nay' on 234, as I feel that the Workman's Occupational Disease Act...."

Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon to turn things around, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'm very hopeful that this will be so, but I doubt it because minds are made up. I do travel to England quite ah.. on numerous times. And I would just like to tell you all, having a great deal of knowledge in relation to what is happening in England, that I predict that the way we're going that we're going to be where England is now in ah... oh.... ten to fifteen years. Now you're not going to listen to me, but believe me, that's exactly what's going to happen. And if you want to live in England under the present conditions there and if you don't believe I'm telling you, you better go look because you are on the road. And by your own foolishness, in relation to what my friend just said a moment ago, I want to add to that the actions of the Environmental Protection Agency why business are leaving Illinois... 193 of them so far to be exact. But I think you better review England because we are on the exact trail and that's where you are now. It's be too late ten or fifteen years from now and you have forgotten that I told you in advance."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ron Hoffman."

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

Let's see, we have 99 green votes on there and I think it's significant right at this point ah.. with just a couple of more weeks to go before



the Session will end, and all of us will be going back to face our constituents and explain what we did down here. I think one of the things that is going to be paramount in the discussion back there is what really we did for the people of the State of Illinois. With these two Bills, I think, most of those that are voting affirmatively can say, 'We took another step to drive a little more industry out of the State of Illinois'. And Ladies and Gentlemen, industry provides jobs, jobs employ the people in your district. The people back there aren't concerned about the small benefits that are driving these two Bills as it relates to most of them, they want jobs. Not one Bill is this General Assembly has encouraged business to remain in Illinois or to make it more conducive to do and perform industrial tasks here and to provide jobs. Not one Bill out of almost 5,000 pieces of legislation has been introduced to encourage business to stay here. What have we considered? We've regulated them, we've taxed them and we've subjugated the initiative to expand and provide jobs for people in our district. If we're going to go back and try to explain to these people that we have spend time down here putting more laws in the books, more regulations... encouraging businesses to look elsewhere, it's going to be pretty hard to convince these people that you're down here serving them. The calls that we have all been getting in the last year indicate that people are afraid. They are afraid of the economy, they're afraid of the future. They want to make sure their jobs are secure...."

Matijevich: "Representative Hoffman, conclude your remarks. Your time is up right now."

Hoffman: "I think I could find someone to yield a second or two."

Matijevich: "... on explanation, so conclude."

Hoffman: "I would just say that those who are voting for the 101 now, remember you're going to have to explain this as more and more jobs disappear from the State of Illinois as to what you participated in to make sure that they have no employment."

Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in order to explain my 'present' vote, I am torn because I do want to help



labor as much as business. I do feel the economic climate of our state and our country today does not militate the drastic changes involved in these Bills and that is why I'm voting 'present'."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria to explain his vote, ah.. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I shant take much of the ah.. time to explain my vote, but I think it's imparitive that I point out to you that just the other night the Governor of this state stood in this Chamber and talked to us about cutting costs. And he mentioned, as part of his speech, that business is bad. And that's why the state revenue is in jeopardy. Now I tell you people in this Chamber that passing Bills ah.. and if these Bills become law... these are going to effect business to the extent that it's going to compound the problem of state revenue from business, which is one of the biggest sources of state revenue across the state. I want to make that point. I believe in compensating the injured employee as much as anyone in this Chamber, but I submit to you that these Bills are not going to get these checks to the injured employee faster. If you people ah.. or the people on the Labor and Commerce Committee would have passed out of Committee House Bill 2785 ah.. sponsored by Representative Schoeberlein and Tuerk, then the injured employee would have gotten his check faster... much faster than he does under the present system... much faster than this system will provide under the provisions of these Bills."

Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On these Bills... the Roll Call is 103 answering 'aye' and 65 answering 'nay' and 3 answering 'present' and these Bills having received the constitutional majority are hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 241."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 241. An Act in relation to the transportation of law enforcement officers by the Metropolitan Transit Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Will you pass it please?"

Matijevich: "Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 248."



Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 248. An Act to amend Section 500 of an Act in relation to a system of unemployment compensation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "Representative Luft on Senate Bill 248."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope you will not read your Digest because in effect ah.. the two Amendments become the Bill. Amendment #1 provides that when an employer files an objection to a former employee receiving unemployment compensation benefits, he must state in writing the cause or reason for filing the objection. Presently, the employer only need object without providing a reason for his objection. Amendment #2, in a sense, prevents teachers from drawing unemployment compensation while in their contract."

Matijevich: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is shall Senate Bill 248 pass. Those voting ah.. favorable ah.. vote affirmative and those opposed vote 'nay'. Take the record. Ah... wait ah.. have all voted who wish? Take the record. Representative Hill voting 'aye'. Take the record. Maragos, 'aye'. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. On this question there are..... Sangmeister, 'aye'. On this question there are 155 'ayes' and 0 'nays' and 2 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 271."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 271. A Bill for an Act to provide an alternative authorization for the issuance and sale of general obligation bonds and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jack Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 271 authorizes local governmental units, which as we know means any counties, cities, villages, incorporated towns, townships, school districts, a council authority or other unit of local government empowered to incur any debts payable from ad valorem tax receipts to issue a general obligation bonds ah.. otherwise authorized, only for sale to the Illinois Municipal Financing Agency which was created now by Senate Bill 162 which passed this House last week. By issuing their



general obligation bonds to the Illinois Municipal Finance Agencies, it is possible that in many local government units will be able to borrow capital funds at a lower interest rate and for longer terms than if they sold their bonds to investment houses. I should define beneficiaries of the Illinois Municipal Finance Agency. They will be the smaller communities, which are sometimes penalized financially because of their lack of access into the National Bond Market or also the trouble of municipalities who might need some assistance. However, I would like to point out the financing difficulties of the small units are not entirely due to low credit or to having no credit rating. As we know the overhead cost of marketing bonds, legal opinions, advertising, payment for ratings, advertising fees and so forth, always tend to be higher for a small bond issue than for a larger bond issue. The administrative cost also per bond are lower than for larger blocks. Furthermore, the smaller units of government actually can't afford to employ the necessary expertise to originate and market their bond issues. I would say that the bonding companies are often reluctant to become involved with a \$50,000 to a \$100,000 bond issue. The small town or unit of government may need to build a library, a recreational center, a senior citizens center. This alternative, a polling arrangement that would result in the Illinois Municipal Financing Agency issuance of perhaps a \$1,000,000 bonds proceeds of which would be used to purchase ten issues, perhaps consisting of \$100,000,000 each and an interest rate that could be 1/2% to 3/4% or lower. In closing, I would wish to emphasize that participation in the Illinois Municipal Financing Program is entirely voluntary. A municipality may, if it chooses, alternately issue its bonds to the Illinois Municipal Financing Agency or on the open market. Also, the communities will only make use of the I.M.F.A. if and when in their own opinion it would be worthwhile to do so. As a local municipal official, I am well aware of the problems that all of these units of local government have and their problems relating to financing. It is my hope that you will give this permission for local governments that they can take advantage of every opportunity to reduce costs.



I ask for a favorable vote on this Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 271.

On the question, Mr. ah... from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

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

I arise to oppose Senate Bill 271. What this Bill will do is to facilitate... to facilitate local government indebtedness. Now in the past and now for most units of local government and school districts there are two restrictions on term indebtedness. The first restriction is the requirement of voter approval, a referendum. The second restriction is the ability of the unit of local government or school district to go into the open competitive market and sell these bonds. And in selling these bonds prove to the satisfaction of the bond holders that they ah.. that the units of local government, the school districts effected, have the ability ah... have the wherewithal to pay off the bonds as they become due. Now with the advent of the 1970 Constitution the one restriction of voter approval referendum for units of local government that are home rule units has been eliminated. The last safeguard with regard to stability of local government indebtedness is the open free market. The passage of this Bill with the approval of Senate Bill 162 is going to remove all restrictions with regards to local government long term indebtedness, particularly with respect to home rule units. I think it's a bad Bill and one that should be ah.. defeated. One in which you should vote 'no'."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Ah... Jack , I'm not familiar with municipal financing, but on the basis of the Digest ah.. is it accurate to say that you could issue general obligation bonds ah... in lieu of revenue bonds that have already been sold?"

Matijevich: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Ah... you could issue ah.. the general obligation bonds for sale ah.. specifically ah.. now to the Illinois Municipal Financing Agency. It will be strictly voluntary. It would not exclude them from putting them out on the open market, but it would give the units of local government this option... this alternative."



Schneider: "So it's an additional alternative."

Williams: "Right."

Schneider: "O'kay."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker ah.. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a couple of questions?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Bluthardt: "Jack, would you explain to me the meaning of the ah.. phrase, 'in lieu of bonds, otherwise authorized' that appears in the Digest? It says, 'to authorize local units of government units of government to issue general obligation bonds in lieu of bonds otherwise authorized.'"

Williams: "Yes, ah... they could issue the general obligation bonds for ah.. sale directly to the Illinois Municipal Financing Agency."

Bluthardt: "In lieu of what other bonds? Are we talking about in lieu of revenue bonds?"

Williams: "Yes, this ah.. would be in lieu of revenue bonds. These would be ah.. G.O. bonds and it would give them an option ah.. an alternative."

Bluthardt: "All right, now ah.. ordinarily revenue bonds do not require referendum. Isn't that correct?"

Williams: "I'm sorry ah.. would you ah.."

Bluthardt: "I say that ah... in many instances the revenue bonds issued ah.. revenue bonds by a municipality does not require a referendum."

Williams: "That's right."

Bluthardt: "So you would allow then ah.. in lieu of non-referendum ah.. revenue bonds the substitution of general obligation bonds of a municipality?"

Williams: "No, that is not correct."

Bluthardt: "I thought you said that. If these bonds that may be issued in lieu of other bonds ah... these general obligation bonds may be issued in lieu of other bonds ah.. include revenue bonds, which were issued by a municipality without referendum. That would mean that you would substitute general obligation bonds for non-referendum revenue bonds and allow the State Municipal Financing Agency to sell them for municipalities."

Matijevich: "On the question, Representative Williams."



Williams: "If I may ah.. I would like to give my time here to Representative Shea, who handled ah..."

Matijevich: "The Majority Leader from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Bluthardt, I think if you'd read Section II of the Bill ah.. it said, 'the corporate authorities of any governmental unit which is authorized to issue general obligation bonds by any other law, may sell and issue general obligation bonds to the authority under the Act to take the place of the general obligation bonds that you sell on the open market'."

Matijevich: "Representative Bluthardt, ah.. are you completed?"

Bluthardt: "No."

Matijevich: "Proceed."

Bluthardt: "Thank you. Well, is the answer that Jack Williams gave ah.. that revenue bonds that may have been issued without referendum ah.. may be substituted for by these general obligation bonds by municipalities?"

Shea: "No, just ah.. the only thing that you can do under this Bill is is you've got authority to issue G.O. bonds that you can issue those G.O. bonds to the Illinois Municipal Finance Authority. In other words, instead of bearer bonds that become bonds payable to the Illinois Municipal Finance Authority. It does not in any way increase the bonding authorization of any unit of government and it specifically does not let them now issue G.O. bonds where before all they could issue were revenue bonds."

Bluthardt: "All right. Maybe you can answer another question that's bothering me. On the ah.. on what theory is it that the statement is repeatedly made that ah.. by issuing bonds and having them sold by this newly created agency, that the bonds of some municipalities will be sold at a lessor interest rate than otherwise would be sold?"

Shea: "Well, can I ask you to think about it in your other role?"

Bluthardt: "I've thought about in that role and that's why I'm rather shocked that a Mayor of one of the wealthiest towns in the State of Illinois would jeopardize the credit of his municipality by sponsoring such a Bill."

Shea: "I don't think he's jeopardizing it and I don't think the Illinois



Municipal League would be for these Bills if..."

Bluthardt: "I don't think they're for them."

Shea: "Well, they certainly are. I sent you the letter....."

Matijevich: "Let's answer the question and then proceed."

Shea: "You could substantially reduce the amount that the bond issue would cost you if you could reduce the interest by 1/2 point or you could reduce the premium that you're paying.... you could reduce the overhead ah.. now where you're paying substantial amount of monies out to ah... councils ah.. to areas like that. You could reduce what it costs you to get the bonds to market and by using the I.M.F.A. you could reduce what it costs you in interest."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the Bill and I would like to ah.. on the side ah.. say to you that I resent having my microphone turned off while I'm recognized for the purpose of questioning... asking questions and speaking on the subject matter. It seems to be a practice of majority party that was never followed in the past in all of the other eight years that I've spend down here."

Matijevich: "Mr. Bluthardt...."

Bluthardt: "It's a practice of the Majority Party to cut off the Minority Party...."

Matijevich: "Representative Bluthardt...."

Bluthardt: ".....while they're speaking."

Matijevich: "Nobody turned your mike off. If I turned your mike off, I'm surely not aware of it."

Bluthardt: "It's been turned off twice since I've been standing here, Mr. Speaker and I think that this Minority Party which in the near future will again become the Majority Party is entitled to be heard. Now I say to you that the only basis by which bonds of a municipality may be sold at a lesser interest rate through this proposed Municipal Bonding Financing Agency is at the expense of those municipalities who are able to sell their bonds on the open market ah.. who have the credit rating that brings in lower interest rates. And if you think that this is going to be voluntary ah.. watch it work in the future when it becomes law ah... and I'm afraid that it will become law. Those



municipalities who wish to sell their bonds because they have high credit rating are going to be forced into using this agency for their sale of bonds and that's the only way that the other municipalities with the lower credit rating are going to be able to enjoy lower interest rates. This is an awful Bill. There is not need for it in the State of Illinois. It ought to be defeated as its companion Bill should have been defeated and had been defeated in past years. I would urge your vote against it."

Matijevich: "As a clarification to Representative Bluthardt, evidently you were on a timer and I wasn't aware of it and that's what turned you off. That's a throw back from the Blair days and I'm sorry about that. I apologize. Representative ah... from McLean, Representative Deavers."

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

Matijevich: "He indicated he will."

Deavers: "Representative Williams, you ah.. speak of lowering the cost of these bonds. What kind of reserve or sinking fund will be established for some type of bad debt situation?"

Williams: "That question you're asking would be a part of Senate Bill 162 which passed the House last week and has nothing to do with this Bill, which just allows municipalities now the alternative to participate in the program. So I think that the question you're asking ah.. should have been asked last week when ah.. 162, which set up the agency passed."

Deavers: "O'kay. What political person really wants this Bill more than anybody else?"

Williams: "I think that all of the municipalities who have been having a hard time with their small issues. What this does ah.. it gives them now an alternative. It's allows a pooling of several issues.... smaller issues ah... \$50,000 ah.. \$100,000 and so forth into one marketable issue that ah.. certainly that we can expect that the interest would a lot lower on an issue of ah.. a million or two than it would be on an issue of fifty or hundred ah.. if it would be picked up at all. And that's the reason for it. Actually, in my own municipality ah.. we would probably not make use of this. As my colleague says, we are



very fortunate in having a very fine assessed evaluation, but there are many other municipalities and units in this state here who will and should be given the opportunity to take advantage to sell their G.O. bonds here to the agency and this is what I ask."

Deavers: "If we want to build a swimming pool and pay for it out of revenue, which is a revenue bond, can we bring this to this department?"

Williams: "No, this is for general obligation bond issues."

Deavers: "As I understand it in talking to all of my municipal officials, the only problems that they have with any kind of bond is the revenue bond. Why don't we take that in and leave the G.O. bonds where they are? They don't seem to have any problem with the G.O. bonds."

Williams: "Well, that would probably be their option to do that, but if ah.. revenue bonds would not be part of this authority that we're trying to give municipalities."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this has been adequately discussed. I move the previous question."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye' and opposed 'nay' and the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook to close, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes, ah.. I would just like to conclude and point out that this authority is granted for the purpose of providing an alternate means of selling bonds ah.. for the purpose of improving the market ability of the bonds involved. It retains all of the present restrictions and limitations by law for the issuance and sale of bonds. And I would like to say again that it is permissive and it just gives the units of government an alternative to ah.. if they want to participate or if they don't want to participate and I would appreciate and urge and 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Matijevich: "The question is shall Senate Bill 271 pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. Hit em. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting 'no' on this because there is something about it



that I don't quite understand. I should have liked to ask the question as to the amount of authorized, but unissued general obligation bonds in this state and perhaps the Sponsor ah.. House Sponsor can indicate that in his closing remarks. I should have liked to have known more definitely whether or not there is a pressing need for this type of Legislation because it seems now that most of the municipalities that I know of have the ability to repay general obligation bonds ah.. or they have the ability to sell them. And finally, I should have liked to know why it is not a limit upon any home rule unit. Why should they be excepted from this Bill? If it's good certainly for the non-home rule units, it certainly should be good for all of them. If it's a state policy, it should be a state policy for all not just some. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I am going to vote 'no'."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for years now we have been fighting the possibility of the skyway bonds being bailed out by the state and I'm afraid that maybe those people who are interested in doing it have at last prevailed. I was hoping that I could ask the Sponsor early in the going ah.. when this Bill was called if he would call it back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment that would definitely preclude that possibility but it seem to me that the language in Section II would certainly permit the issuance of general obligation bonds and the consequent redemption of the revenue bonds at something well over what the ah.. market value of them is at present. I would hope that the Gentleman would respond to this, but not at the moment because I'd just like to reiterate what Representative Bluthardt said that what we're doing here ah... once again and we've done it a lot this Session, we're rewarding people, agencies that do not do a good job. We're rewarding the fiscally irresponsible in this case by letting the pool their bonds with municipalities and other governmental units that do a good job and can sell and can have a good rating and can sell their bonds at a low interest rate. This is a bad concept and should be defeated and I would hope, Mr. Speaker,



because I'm very serious about the skyway, that the Gentleman would respond to this and hopefully bring it back to Second Reading. I just got a lot of gobblity goop from the Majority Leader that this can't happen. I'm not convinced at all and it wouldn't be asking too much, I don't think to bring it back and amend it so that it would be absolutely impossible."

Matijevich: "Plug your ears, Representative Walsh. The Majority Leader from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. I know that there's a lot of people that are trying to beat this Bill. This is a companion to Senate Bill 162 that passed out of this Chamber and it allows municipal governments, units of local government, to issue bonds to the I.M.F.A. in lieu of issuing bonds to bearer. There's nothing about ah.. that this can take the place of revenue bonds. As the former Majority Leader that used to stand on that side of the aisle used to say, 'You're raising a lot of sawdust about nothing. Just trying to find a place to hang your hat'. This is a good Bill. It will reduce the cost of local government. It will reduce the cost of what the property taxpayers have to bear in their real estate tax and I would hope that it would pass."

Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 'ayes' and 58 'nays' and 6 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 283."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 283. A Bill for an Act creating the Local Governmental Tax Study Commission and defining its powers and duties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Beatty."

Beatty: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...."

Matijevich: "Excuse me, Representative Beatty. Before you do ah.. we have an announcement. The intention of the House is to break at 6:30 for dinner and return at 8:00. We've got a lot of business to do. The Democratic secretaries vs. the Republican Secretaries game, has been postponed to Friday, June 27th or sooner. Tonight the press



evidently is still playing their game at diamond 6. Is that called off too? That's called off too. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as indicated, this Bill recreates Local Tax Study Commission for another year. The reason for this Commission is to determine how personal property tax can be replaced. This was...this was mandated by the Constitutional Convention. I believe that it is an important and a necessary Commission and we hope in the forthcoming year to proceed and try to find an answer to this problem."

Matijevich: "Representative Beatty has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 283. Is there any discussion? If not, on the question all in favor of this House Bill...a...Senate Bill signify by voting aye. All opposed by voting nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On Senate Bill 283, the record is 118 voting aye, 9 voting nay, 4 voting present, and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 285."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 285. An Act to amend Sections 401 and so forth of the Unemployment Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "On Senate Bill 285, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tom Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, so that we do not get into a lengthy debate on an issue that had fifteen Amendments that had been offered for adoption to this Bill, a Bill that has been thoroughly discussed in the previous months and certainly most Representatives of this House have certainly taken a firm commitment either for or against, based on their own true beliefs on whether or not we should increase the benefits to those who are unemployed and in view of the fact that the Supreme Court ruling the other day, which makes unemployment benefits beneficiaries eligible even to receive public aid, I suggest that to cut a lot of the debate down, I don't believe that there are that many people whom I could sway in any way, shape or form into supporting this Bill either for it or against it with any dialogue that God has given me to the talent to use, I therefore ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 285, which will allow a



modest increase and I once again, say a modest increase in the benefits to those unemployed persons in Illinois compared to what was offered by some of the Amendments that were offered on the floor of the House the other day and I ask for a favorable vote."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry has moved the passage of Senate Bill 285. Is there discussion on the issue? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I've always thought what's good for the goose ought to be good for the gander. Now let's look at Senate Bill 285. It allows an individual who's unemployed for more than twenty days to collect benefits for all weeks for which he has been unemployed thereby waiving the one week waiting period. But let's look at what the unions themselves practice with regards to their unemployment compensation which is commonly referred to as Strike Benefit Funds. The Monthly Labor Review, the United States Department of Labor pointed out that twenty one unions still maintain a one week waiting period before paying strike benefits. Twenty-eight unions maintain a two week period. Three maintain a three week waiting period, three maintain a four week waiting period. The average waiting period for all seventy-one unions polled was 2.4 weeks despite the fact that 60% of all labor work stoppages are ended in two weeks. If the unions themselves believe in waiting weeks, why should the one week waiting period in unemployment compensation be eliminated? Senate Bill 285, along with Senate Bills 234 and 235, are going to accelerate the movement of industry and business out of Illinois will bring about the closure of businesses and the reconsequent result will be a loss of employment and a reduction in local and government income. I urge a no vote on Senate Bill 285 indicating that's what good for the goose ought to be good for the gander."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Clarence Neff."

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I think this is another Bill we all know is very similar to House Bill 488. We've all had the...a...realize what...what...what has happened in Illinois in 1978, 98 firms moved out of Illinois, removing 30,000 jobs from the State...and...a...this wouldn't have...certainly with Senate Bill 285, it certainly wouldn't



accelerate this with the loss in industry again would like the last 234 and 235 instead of helping the working man, we're hurting the working man because by passing this type of legislation he's going to ...he's bound to lose his job. And the State of Illinois is also the loser, the State...a...taxes...a...a...loss, we've heard been brought out here before, that the Governor brought out on his program, what we've lost in income to the State of Illinois and we're encouraging this. And again, we're hurting that man that we think that we're trying to help and we're going to drive out a lot of businesses...a...either out of the State or they'll be closed up and therefore I think this Bill should definitely be opposed."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is hard to conceive of a greater disservice in the long run to the working men and women of the State of Illinois than the passage of this Bill. On the surface, this Bill will increase unemployment compensation benefits to those out of work. Illinois already pays the second highest benefits in the nation, but this Bill will even increase those payments and that's on the surface. It is the long term indirect effect of this Bill on the jobless that worries me. Between 1967 and 1972, the date of the last industrial census, 195 firms with 20 or more employees left Illinois, which created a net loss of 87,000 jobs. That was nearly double the national percentage of net manufacturing job loss during the same period. Illinois' tax climate is already anti-business, which means it is anti-jobs. And with the passage of this Legislation we would only make the situation worse. In the long run, it is the working men and women who will suffer when more are made jobless by businesses and industries closing down and leaving the State of Illinois. There are those who say that this Bill will increase employer contributions to the unemployment compensation trust fund by many many percentages. The small businesses may be forced to close. Larger ones may leave the State. We all want to see the needs of the working men and women of Illinois fulfilled, but we don't want to further enlarge the ranks of the jobless by the passage of this Bill which this distinguished Body has wisely defeated in this Session already."



Is it to be a responsible program of unemployment compensation in Illinois?"

Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Daniels: "...that will provide for the needs of all working people of Illinois over the long run? Or is it to be chicken today and feathers tomorrow? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask and solicit your red light vote on this Bill, Senate Bill 234 and 235 were Acts one and two, and Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 285 is Act three and closing the curtain on the businesses in the State of Illinois if it's passed. Thank you."

Matijevich: "Act Four, the Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Don Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will, proceed."

Anderson: "Mr. Sponsor, you purport this to be a mild increase for the people out of work. The poor people at the lower end of the scale are really getting ripped off on this Bill. Its cutting them by 24%, is that correct, Mr. Sponsor?"

Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I don't know where you are using your figures from. Are you using them from the figures that were put out by the ..."

Anderson: "Yes sir."

Hanahan: "...that's right, then."

Anderson: "And the fellows at the upper end of the scale are getting an increase."

Hanahan: "If you're askin' me whether this is upper or lower scales, I'd say that anyone who is unemployed don't have a scale, there unemployed."

Anderson: "Yes, but with a fifty dollar income cutting their unemployment by 24%, that doesn't make sense."

Hanahan: "Well if we...well if we had all your cooperation to pass a good minimum wage law where persons wouldn't be employed, gainfully employed at exploited wages of \$2 and \$3 an hour then I'd say we wouldn't be faced with that kind of choice."

Anderson: "I maintain your exploiting the man at the lower end of the scale now by this Bill and I'm going to vote against it."



Hanahan: "You were anyway."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski. Representative Byers, I'm sorry. Somebody was waving over there. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise in support of this Bill and I...am I on?"

Matijevich: "Representative Byers, just talk into your mike, get a little closer."

Byers: "Okay. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to rise in support of this Bill. For the other side of the aisle, we continue to hear the Chamber of Commerce hand-out that these people were parroting and I think that that's very unfair. There are two sides to every program and I do think that it is time that we do something for the working people in the State of Illinois. We've had Bills that we've passed to raise interest rates and we've...we've done very little for the working man in this 79th Session of the General Assembly. And I think this is one of the last chances that the other side of the aisle is going to have a chance to do something and I think they'd better get on this Bill. Its a good Bill, its a good Bill for the people of Illinois and the working men and women of this State need this. I support it and urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to show a little compassion for the working people and support this Bill."

Matijevich: "The Lord of Lawrenceville, Representative Roscoe Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's safely predictable that workers of Illinois are about to win a Pyrrhic Victory. But two or three more such victories, if they are going to win here today, and they'll all be unemployed and there'll be no one to pay the benefits except the State of Illinois. The largest employer in one of my counties, a shoe factory in Flora, within the month announced that it was closing down its operations. And frantic efforts were made by a concerned citizenry, artificial respiration was undertaken, its now back in operation, hanging on by its eyelashes. But its demise is predictable because the Japanese diet, nor the Italian Chamber of Deputies, handicapped their producers of shoes with any such



burden as this greatly enlarged unemployment insurance tax that you now propose to put on all the employers of Illinois, including the shoe factory that I mentioned. I ask you to contemplate just for a few minutes, the hardship that you will cause throughout the State of Illinois if, in your mistaken zeal, you destroy industry, jobs, and opportunity for all of us. Its time to vote no, irrespective of political consequences by those whose endorsement you cherish."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sam Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this...this ...a..Bill has been discussed previously and everyone has had their thoughts on this and therefore I move the previous question."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be out. All in favor say aye. Opposed nay. The previous question prevails. To close, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Tom Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be brief, I could just say that in behalf of those people who really want to work and those people who are seeking jobs and those people, who through no fault of their own, leave an increase in their benefits in the benefits that we, the State Legislature control by statute, I plead with every Member of this House to consider how you vote on various issues concerning your own pay raises. To consider about the issues when you vote for increases for county officers and to consider your votes when you increased various other organizational municipal, county, or state officers' salaries, how easily you vote for those things. Now we're talking about people who, through no fault of their own, are unemployed. And I say to the Gentleman from Southern Illinois that my heart really goes out to those people working in a shoe factory that happened to be closed down because of the multi-national corporations that really are funded by the very organizations that are opposing Senate Bill 285. Let's look at the facts instead of the fallacies. Let's look at the truth here. The Chamber of Commerce and the Manufacturers Association pay dues into by corporations that are truly multi-national. That are truly the ones creating the very unemployment that we are condemning here by some of our actions. That



when we have closings of factories, why, we asked the question. Why is this work being shipped to Japan? Or to Italy or to West Germany? Why are there so many Volkswagens on the streets? Why are there so many foreign televisions and computers...in...in Japan? But let me look into it and see what I see in it. The fact remains that the very corporations that..that own and operate here in the United States and the State of Illinois, you'll find, are multi-national corporations and subsidiaries of multi-national corporations that own and operate the plants over seas. So who's creating this unemployment that we are faced with? And then at the same time to come like..with...with crocodile tears in their eyes and say to the General Assembly 'well, we shouldn't increase the very needed and meager amounts of unemployment compensation to the worker, that no-good bum, the person that's so lazy, that person who is no good, and shiftless, that same person, who for years, sweated and toiled to provide the profits of those companies'. Its very odd to me that those same multi-national corporations who are fronted by the Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers Association, and the other voices of the business community are coming here at the same time and saying 'you're gonna drive the business out of Illinois, you're gonna drive the business over seas'. When we are the same group that are causing it with their multi-national investments. And I say to you, for shame, for shame on us. I ask the Members of the General Assembly if you weigh the difference between the Amendments offered to this Bill the other day on the floor of this House, when in weighing the difference..."

Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Hanahan: "...between this amount of money that we offering...asking in 285 and the amount of money that was offered by the business community Representatives of this House, I would say it was \$3 and \$4 a week at best. I think it's a meager amount to ask for and I ask for a favorable vote."

Matijevich: "The question is shall Senate Bill 285 pass. All in favor will signify by saying aye. All opposed by voting nay. On explanation of votes, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Calvin Skinner."

Skinner: "You know my colleagues here in the House may have a difficult time telling when my colleague from McHenry is serious, totally serious,



or only partially serious. Today, I'm not quite sure. I do know that I have been subject to the same phone calls from small businessmen in my district as he has been. The only difference is the ones contacting me are probably Republicans and the ones contacting him are Democrats. I do know that for years big business and big labor have gotten together on something they have snowed small business into understanding..into believing is an agreed Bill process. Well let me tell you what's been happening. Big business and big labor have been agreeing to sell out little business and little labor. Now I would hope that Representative Hanahan would get together with me and small businessmen, both Republicans and Democrats, during the summer and do something constructive to change this formula so that we can direct ourselves to some of the real problems in unemployment compensation. And those real problems are two-teared. They are, on the first level, can a person live on the amount of money that he is getting from the unemployment compensation formula as it exists in this State? But perhaps, more importantly, on the second level, can we find some way to keep small business in business in the State of Illinois? I believe my colleague is sincere and I believe if this is defeated as I believe it should be defeated, this time, right now, with this formula, that he and I and some small businessmen in our community can get together and come out with something of the true compromise and not something that just benefits big business and big labor. And as a postscript, I'd like to mention one thing..."

Matijevich: "Mr. Skinner, would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Skinner: "...in my district called Chrysler Corporation and I have not yet gotten a letter from them opposed to this Bill. And I think the reason I haven't gotten a letter is because big business, that is Chrysler Corporation, and big labor, that is United Auto Workers, are going to cut up the difference between the one-third, let's say, that's being paid in unemployment compensation now and the two-thirds that will end up being paid. They're going to split the difference between them..

Matijevich: "Representative Skinner, will you please bring your remarks to a close? Representative Totten from Cook?"

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd...I'd indicated to you that I had



a House Bill 301...Senate Bill 301 coming up and I have a meeting on the Appropriations process right now and I'd like to ask leave so if you get passed that, and come back to it."

Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave if we go beyond 301 to return to it. He asked leave. Er, explanation of vote, Representative Grotberg from Kane County."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my no vote. I would remind that this House how quick we are to help take 6% out of the State budget and probably, how quick we are to just turn around and just pass it on back to the only source there is of income in the State of Illinois, the only real source, jobs...and business creates jobs. I wish there were some other way. I wish the State of Illinois could print money, they can't...the federal government who seems to be able to print more than we can use on every occasion. But there is just is no conscienable reason for crippling the only source of real personal income in the State of Illinois, your job and mine, when we go back home, the...this...the world has gone crazy, the world has forgotten where money comes from, and you have an opportunity here to remember and vote no."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I would just suggest to the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House that this Bill is so similar to 488 that I would suggest to the sponsor that he just accept the same Roll Call as was on 488."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to be the first to volunteer to educate both the Representatives from McHenry on the subjects of which they talked about, one on unemployment comp. and the other on multi-national companies. Now I never heard so many inaccurate statements in my life as both of these fellows from McHenry...and I think they need a short course in economics, as well as unemployment comp. and multi-national concept. But let me remind you that...that back in 1973 we passed a compromise Bill which provided for a 14% increase and last year, when the benefits went into effect in January and increased to 12%. That's a total of 26%. This Bill will increase on the average of 32%, so I suggest to you that over the last



two years, we're gonna increase unemployment comp. by some 56 to 58%. This not only changes the concept of unemployment comp. but tremendously increases the benefits, gives an incentive to sit on...and... on your rocking chair on the front porch and rock away instead of going back to work and I suggest that this Bill is totally as bad as House Bill 488 and I suggest a no vote."

Matijevich: "The Lady from Lake County, Representative Adeline Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm speaking simply on a matter of common sense. There's no doubt that we do have to have an increase in the State's...in the...in the unemployment compensation. I never did contest that. What I'm contesting is the fact that any employee...does...cannot...does not receive a full twenty-six weeks of unemployment compensation benefits when the ceiling of three thousand was removed. That means any employee, the good employee, when he's out of a job is going to find his Union Trust Fund depleted. I might point out that another point, when the definition of someone who honors a picket line is changed from that of a National Labor Relations Board definition and is called non-participants, then we are posing in effect what the national law says. The third point I'd like to bring up, and I quote from the Month Labor Review figures. 'Twenty-one unions still maintain a one-week waiting period before paying strike benefits, twenty-eight unions maintain a two-week period, three maintain a three-week waiting period, three maintain a four-week waiting period. Under Senate Bill 285, the State's Employees Trust Fund would be required to pay all of the twenty-six weeks of benefit for any individual no matter how much the individual earns...."

Matijevich: "Mrs. Geo-Karis, would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Geo-Karis: "I'll try real fast. All I can say is this. I don't care if anyone wants to accuse me to be against labor, I'm not. I worked in a factory, I know what it is. But for heaven sakes, if we don't use common sense, we're not going to have any business in which it is good honest labor can work."

Matijevich: "From Winnebago, the Minority Whip, Representative Tim Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my-



negative vote, we are changing in this Bill, the historical philosophy of unemployment compensation for paying for involuntary unemployment to that of voluntary, by the provisions of this Bill. A second reason, which I am explaining my no vote, that the distinguished sponsor of this Bill of castigating some of those industries for opening up plants over seas. Let me tell you why business goes over seas. Because when American business and industry can no longer compete with Japanese foreign type products in this country because of the many inflationary demands of organized labor, they are forced to go on the same type of competitive business, and that's opening plants in other countries that have a more favorable business attitude. So if you want to know why business and industry is leaving the State of Illinois and the United States and our balance of trade is getting loss effect, its because of this type of legislation and that's why I'm voting no."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Romie Palmer."

Palmer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, to explain my no vote, I understand, I haven't heard any discussion of this on the floor by the House sponsor or anyone else, that it will cost about \$600,000,000, new dollars in Illinois, for the increased cost...a...private cost of the unemployment compensation, that it will cost the State of Illinois in increased new dollars about \$10,000,000 for the increased cost to State government. I haven't heard any discussion at all about what it would cost the local units of government, especially the school districts and Lord only knows what it might cost there. I think, perhaps, we've gone too far. Perhaps some tempering of demands in this respect that's more palatable to the economic conditions of today would be in order. But not this far reaching thing because it makes no difference if increases in unemployment compensation goes to the worker and then the...a... price of the goods that he has and services that he has to buy goes up as it inverably will. It makes no difference perhaps on the ten or fifteen million dollars if we're going to be taxed for that as we inescapably will,..."

Matijevich: "Representative Palmer, bring your remarks to a close."

Palmer: "I shall, Mr. Speaker. And for these reasons I think its almost



a case of the dog wagging the tail...chasing the tail and in one bad economic spiral which can only make matters worse for everyone. For these reasons, I vote no."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Webber Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, now I have nothing to do with labor. In a sense, I lay by myself. And neither do I own any stock in any industry. I have nothing to do and never have had anything to do with industry. I can look at it from a sort of an objective point of view and an historical point of view. Now I ask... I do have to confess I'm in government, along with the rest of us. The three greatest dangers to our country at this time, and what is causing factories to go over seas or leave Illinois...or...a...leaving Illinois is number one, government, ourselves, by our actions, by what we're doing for example, right now. A minor one is the Environmental Agency, which I mentioned. And one of the greatest of all, and I've heard this over seas, is our own labor, so I'd like to point my finger now at my friend from McHenry County, who is pointing it, in a sense, at me and the rest of us a little while ago, and point out to him he is the one...and what he represents is what has caused our country more trouble and will cause it more trouble in the future by their actions and the type of Bill that is...that is being passed today. It is labor and organized labor that is one of the greatest dangers to freedom and to our democracy at this time in this country. And I'm telling you again is look at a few of the foreign..."

Matijevich: "Representative Borchers, bring your remarks to a close."

Borchers: "That is it. I close with a reminder that look at England."

Matijevich: "Amen. Look at England. The last but not the least to explain his vote...from Champaign County, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you...thank you Mr. Speaker. The sponsor's comments brought so many tears to my eyes, I can't find my switch, so will you please vote me no."

Matijevich: "Record Representative Hirschfeld no. There's one more to explain his vote, from Vermillion, Representative Chuck Campbell."

Campbell: "A...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can see that it's futile to talk against this Bill with the number of votes



that are up there. But I just simply want to say that by the action of this House today, you're helping to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. And I vote no."

Matijevich: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 104 voting aye, 66 voting nay, 2 voting present, and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 286."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 286. A Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook County, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 286 is a Grand Jury By-Pass Bill, which permits prosecution for felonies on information where a preliminary hearing before a judge finds probable cause. Senate Amendment #1 to the Bill which would have attached jeopardy at a preliminary hearing was a kind of racial Amendment. That has been deleted by House Amendment #1. In the form that the Bill is now before us on Third Reading, I know of no opposition to the Bill and I urge your support."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the passage of Senate Bill 286. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor shall vote aye. Those opposed signify by voting nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this issue there are 137 voting aye. None voting nay, 5 voting present, and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 296 is out of the record. Senate Bill 301, Representative Totten has not returned. Senate Bill 321. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 321. An Act in relation to the extension of time for filing returns under the Gas Revenue Tax Act and Public Utility Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Senate..on Senate Bill 321, Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 321 amends Section III of the Gas Revenue Tax Act and Section III of the Public



Utilities Revenue Act to permit the Director of the Department of Revenue to grant up to 20...31 day extension of time for filing of the return. That's all this Bill does. I'd appreciate your support."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the passage of Senate Bill 321. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is shall this Bill pass? All in favor shall signify by voting aye, opposed by voting nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this issue the vote is 137 voting aye, 2 voting nay, 3 voting present, and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 336, the Clerk will read the Bill."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 336. An Act to amend an Act to revise into law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook on Senate Bill 336, Representative Sam Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 336 corrects the present laws of not adding to it. Because of some ambiguity in the present statutes, which the Supreme Court has ruled is not sufficient enough and therefore it is corrective language to conform with the requirements of the Supreme Court in the case of the People et al Ramey vs. the G. M. & O. Railroad Company. This has to do with the recognizance of the county in order to facilitate the assessment procedure and I ask for your aye vote."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the passage of Senate Bill 336. On discussion, the Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Richard Hart."

Hart: "I'd like to ask the sponsor a question."

Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman yield?"

Margos: "Yes."

Hart: "As I understand this, what you're doing is, you're going to allow ...if this Bill passes, the levying of the taxes for these two particular items without...on the outside of the corporate rate. Is that right?"

Maragos: "Yes, the point that has happened, Representative Hart, the counties have been doing this in the past. And the reason that the



Supreme Court asserts that the language is not definitive...a..a..they wanted more explicit language in the statute and that is what it has done. Because by ...by..practice now, most of the county officials throughout the State have been doing this and only to facilitate the assessment procedures and expedite and make it a long one, I think, tax saving money to the people because of the new properties that they've developed."

Mativevich: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'm going to have to take issue with that explanation. Actually, what this Bill is going to do is to allow a tax increase without a referendum. I don't care whether or not 102 County Clerks have been doing this in the past. They've been doing it illegally. And what this Bill really does is not to clarify the language in the Supreme Court, but to overcome the language of the Supreme Court and allow these two levies for these two particular items to be made outside of or in addition to that amount that we are authorized by statute for the corporate rate. So...if you are for...if you want to vote for a Bill to increase taxes without a referendum you should vote yes on this Bill. If you want to not vote for a Bill to increase taxes without a referendum then it should be defeated and I urge a no vote."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Harry Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question for the sponsor."

Matijeich: "He indicates he will yield. Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Representative Maragos, Senate Bill 336 seems to ...a.. remove a limit that's now applicable to counties. Is that correct?"

Maragos: "Not now. The fact is the language states that it should not be a limit. The present language, as I just gave the statute to Representative to look at when he came over here, if he could just read the language that is already in the Act and only just makes it more definitive for the purposes that were in there. It was never really considered to be part of the levy."

Leinenweber: "Alright, now I live in a home rule unit. I see that House Amendment #1 provides that this Bill should not be a limit on a home rule unit. Now...a...how can a removal of a limit...a...not be a



limit? Or isn't that a double negative and wouldn't that be a limit then on home rule units?"

Maragos: "What it does, Mr. Leinenweber, the fact that they put the Amendment on, I think it was on the action of the Committee when they put this on. The point is what they've done here is to try to show that it would not be a limit to the home rule powers. So that...that's the only reason they got this Amendment. And primarily those counties that have home rule powers are not presently subject to any rate limit that I know of."

Leinenweber: "Well this seems to be the ultimate in...a...in a home rule exclusion."

Matijevec: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Calvin Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in spite of the humor of the previous speaker, I think it should be emphasized that what we're doing here is not changing the intent of the original Legislation. What we are doing is telling the Judicial Branch that they can't read what we've written. The law right now says that 2.5 cent per hundred dollars of assessed valuation taxed shall be in addition to the maximum of taxes authorized by law for county purposes. Now anybody that can stand on this floor and tell me that that's not clear, probably deserves to be a judge."

Matijevec: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos, to close."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, as explained, this does not change the present Act, it just clearly defines it, I move for your adoption and aye vote."

Matijevec: "The question is shall Senate Bill 336 pass. All in favor will signify by voting aye, those opposed by voting nay. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the language, if I may, in explaining my vote of the present statute on Section 433 of Chapter 34, which has to do with counties. And this deals with counties only in northern municipalities. At the bottom of the last paragraph of Section 433 says 'the expense of making such maps or plats of copies shall be borne by the county. For the purpose of paying such expense of the



county, may levy an annual tax of not to exceed 0.2, a .025% of this value as equalized or specified by the Department of L.G.A. And then now this exact language referring to says 'which tax shall be in addition to the maximum tax that is authorized by law for county purposes'. That is presently the law and I don't understand the reason why the Supreme Court ruled this way, but in order to define the purposes that have been going...which have not been legal, because therefore, we ask for the clarification, otherwise, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of your county officials who have been doing this based on the law as it stands now and as Representative Skinner says, who has a feeling that this was the law, are going to be held in jeopardy and I think this is unfair when this is explicit. But for reasons of their own, the Supreme Court has ruled and therefore we are reiterating..."

Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Maragos: "...our legislative intent."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo, to explain his vote."

Calvo: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to explain to those voting present or red, that none less that Maurice Scott supports this Bill. Now what's been happening in the counties throughout the State is that these expenses have been levied separately from the corporate rate for the past six or eight years. Now some of the large taxpayers decided, probably rightfully so under the law, that this should not be done and therefore they filed an exception and would not pay their taxes, an objection rather. The Court held that that objection was correct and that this should not have been levied outside of the corporate county levy. Now what this Bill does is allow the maps and plats to be prepared with funds outside of the county levy. Now in a county that's any where near maximum, needs this Bill and needs it badly. They've been levying outside and they've collected taxes outside for the past six years. However, it has not been declared to be illegal and if you don't pass this Bill, you're just going to break these counties that are nearly broke from the standpoint of not being able to live within their present corporate



levy. This does not raise..."

Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Calvo: "...this does not raise the present corporate levy at all. It only legalizes what they've been doing and I would ask your favorable vote for the counties that need it."

Matijevich: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I thought there was a question about...Mr. Beaupre, he wants to ask something."

Matijevich: "I didn't see his light on. Does Representative Beaupre seek recognition? No. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well is it closed or not?"

Matijevich: "We haven't declared the vote. Do you want to explain your vote?"

Hart: "Is the board closed? That's my question."

Matijevich: "Yes, it's closed."

Hart: "Well thank you. I had my light on to talk."

Matijevich: "Well I just called on you, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well it's a little point..."

Matijevich: "I can't speak for you, go ahead."

Hart: "Well I can speak for you and it's a little pointless to close the voting on the board and then allow continued explanations of votes and I don't appreciate that kind of treatment."

Matijevich: "Representative Hart, I didn't see your light until after I said 'have all voted who wished'. I'm sorry."

Hart: "Well, I just want to reiterate what I did before and I think Representative Calvo explained it pretty well in terms of what it really does. You can justify any tax increase if you want to do it on the basis of somebody needs the money. But the question that you are voting on here is whether or not you want to authorize it without a referendum. And exactly what he said was that they've been doing it, its illegal, and if you want to continue to do it, you have to authorize it by statute and there's no referendum attached to this Bill and I would urge that it be defeated."

Matijevich: "The Clerk...the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative



Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Would you please change my vote to 'no'."

Matijevich: "Change Representative Hirschfeld to 'no'. Stearney to 'no'. Representative Jones to 'no'. Stearney votes 'no'. The ah... J. David Jones, 'no'. The Gentleman from... let's dump this Roll Call and start all over. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill the votes are 81 answering 'aye' and 42 answering 'nay' and 14 answering 'present' and Representative Maragos, the Gentleman from Cook."

Maragos: "I'd like to have a poll of the absentees."

Matijevich: "Poll the absentees."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Gene Barnes. Brummet. Byers. Byers, 'aye'. Campbell... Campbell, 'no'. Catania. Chapman... Chapman, 'aye'. Collins... Collins, 'no'. Craig... Craig, 'aye'. Duff. Ewell. Farley. Fleck. Gaines.... Gaines, 'aye'. Geo-Karis. Giorgi. Hanahan. Ron Hoffman. Emil Jones. Keller. Ksopak. LaFleur. Lundy. Mautino. McClain. Mugalian. Neff. O'Daniel... 'aye'? Ah... Neff, 'no'. O'Daniel. Peters. Pierce. Rayson. Rose. Schisler. Schoeberlein. E.G. Steele... E.G. Steele, 'no'. Stone. Stubblefield. Telcser. Washington... Washington, 'aye'. Williams. Mr. Speaker. Ah.. Barnes, 'aye'."

Matijevich: "The Clerk will take the record. The record is ah.... ah... the ah... Representative Mugalian votes 'aye'. Mautino votes 'aye'. Representative Lundy votes 'aye'. Representative Pierce votes 'aye'. The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, I know that it's over 89 so I would like to ah.. at the appropriate time ah.. so everybody will be on record on this thing, ah.. have a verification."

Matijevich: "At this time it is 91 'ayes' and 46 'nays' and the Gentleman from Franklin has asked for a verification of the.... the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I've been patiently waiting to explain my vote and you took the record this last time without calling on my and I didn't think that ah... you know, I'd appreciate that opportunity if that would be



possible. I'd like to speak to my colleagues who have been standing up here speaking in favor of Bills to bail out county government. And I would like to suggest to them that everyone that has passed so far that will take a dime from state revenue is going to be vetoed by the Governor. Now this is a Bill that the decision has been made on by previous Legislators. They said it shall be in addition to the ten cent county general fund. It is for property tax assessments. Now if one cannot justify ratifying what a past Legislature has done to raise the property taxes for property tax assessment purposes, I can't imagine what you can justify raising property taxes for. Now we're not raising them. What we're doing is saying that the law as it exists shall be interpreted as prior Legislators thought they had written the law and not as judges have interpreted it."

Matijevich: "The Members will be in their seats and the Clerk will proceed with the verification by calling the affirmative votes."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Anderson. Gene Barnes. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Beaupre. Berman. Bradley. Brandt. Brinkmeier. Byers. Calvo. Capparelli. Chapman. Craig. Daniels. D'Arco. Darrow. Davis. DiPrima. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Fary. Fennessey. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Greiman. Grotberg. Gene Hoffman. Holeweinski. Dan Houlihan. Jim Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Katz. Kelly. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Kornowicz. Leon. Lucco. Luft. Lundy. Madigan. Mann. Maragos. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McAvoy. McGrew. McLendon. McMaster. McPartlin. Merlo. Molloy. Mudd. Mugalian. Nardulli. Patrick. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Randolph. Rigney. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sharp. Shea. Skinner. Taylor. Terzich. VonBoeckman. Waddell. Wall. Washburn. Washington. White. Willer. Younge. Yourell."

Matijevich: "Representative VanDuyne, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Matijevich: "Change Representative VanDuyne from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Williams."



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

Matijevich: "How is Representative Williams recorded?"

Williams: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Record Representative Williams as voting 'aye'. On the verification... the Gentleman from Franklin with questions of the affirmative votes."

Hart: "Representative Craig?"

Matijevich: "Representative Craig ah.. is he in his seat? He is in his seat. Representative VonBoeckman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be verified. I have to leave."

Matijevich: "Record Representative VonBoeckman as voting 'aye'."

VonBoeckman: "I'm already recorded as 'aye'. I just want to be verified. I have to leave."

Matijevich: "Ah.. oh ah.. well, does he have leave to be verified? You have leave. Continue, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Representative Flinn?"

Matijevich: "Representative Flinn ah.. is he in his seat?"

Hart: "Representative Gaines?"

Matijevich: "Wait a minute. I don't see Representative Flinn. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hart: "Representative Gaines?"

Matijevich: "Representative Gaines is in his seat."

Hart: "Representative Garmisa?"

Matijevich: "Representative Garmisa ah.. I don't see him in his seat or on the floor? How is Representative Garmisa recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Aye."

Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Hart: "Representative Getty?"

Matijevich: "Is Representative Getty on the floor? I neither see him in his seat or on the floor. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Aye."

Matijevich: "Remove Representative Getty from the Roll Call."

Hart: "Representative J.M. Houlihan?"



Matijevich: "Representative J.M. Houlihan is in his seat."

Hart: "Representative Huff?"

Matijevich: "Representative Huff, ah.. is he back there? Yes, he is in his seat."

Hart: "Representative Kelly?"

Matijevich: "Representative Kelly... is Representative Kelly in his seat?"

I don't see him in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Aye."

Matijevich: "Remove Representative Kelly from the Roll Call."

Hart: "Representative Kucharski?"

Matijevich: "Representative Kucharski is in his seat."

Hart: "Representative Lechowicz?"

Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz is standing in the aisle."

Hart: "Representative Leon?"

Matijevich: "Representative Leon... is Representative Leon on the floor?"

I don't see the Gentleman. How is Representative Leon recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Aye."

Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative McClain... record Representative McClain voting 'aye'. Representative Ewell... record Representative Ewell as voting 'aye'. Representative Brummet... record Representative Brummet as voting 'aye'. Representative Schisler....as voting 'aye'. Return Representative Leon to the Roll Call. Representative Reed... record Representative Reed as voting 'aye'. Representative Leverenz as voting 'aye'. Proceed, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Representative McGrew?"

Matijevich: "Representative McGrew ah.. I don't see him in his seat and I don't see him on the floor? How is Representative McGrew recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Aye."

Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Schlickman desires to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Good for him."

Hart: "Representative McPartlin?"

Matijevich: "Representative McPartlin is in the middle aisle."

Hart: "Representative Molloy?"

Matijevich: "Representative Molloy ah.. I don't see him in his seat. He's



coming out of the boy's room."

Hart: "Representative Patrick?"

Matijevich: "Is Representative Patrick in the back row? I don't see him in his seat and I don't ah.. yes, ah.. he's there."

Hart: "Representative Pierce?"

Matijevich: "Representative Pierce is in the front row."

Hart: "O'kay. Representative Polk?"

Matijevich: "Representative Polk is sitting in his seat."

Hart: "Representative Ryan?"

Matijevich: "Representative Ryan ah.. is Representative Ryan on the floor? I don't see Representative Ryan on the floor. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Aye."

Matijevich: "Take him off the Roll Call. Proceed."

Hart: "Representative Schraeder?"

Matijevich: "Representative Schraeder ah.. is he in his seat? He's in the back."

Hart: "Representative Sharp?"

Matijevich: "Representative Sharp ah.. I don't see him in his seat nor on the floor. How is he recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Aye."

Matijevich: "Remove Representative Sharp from the Roll Call. Representative Downs, for what purpose do you rise?"

Downs: "Change me from 'present' to 'aye', please."

Matijevich: "Record Representative Downs from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Griesheimer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Griesheimer: "Change my vote from 'nay' to 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Change Griesheimer from 'nay' to 'aye' and return Representative Flinn to the Roll Call. Representative Flinn... Representative Mudd, I mean. Ah... record Representative Mudd as voting 'no'. Do you have anymore questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Representative Hart? Representative Mudd changed from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I think I'm ah.. I don't know. How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Matijevich: "How is Representative Geo-Karis recorded?"



Fredric B. Selcke: "Absent."

Geo-Karis: "Put mine 'aye', please."

Matijevich: "Record Representative Matijevich as voting 'aye'. There being no further.... Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Matijevich: "How is he recorded?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "Absent."

Stubblefield: "Would you record me as voting 'no', please?"

Matijevich: "Record Stubblefield as voting 'no'. There being no further questions of the Affirmative Roll Call; Mr. Clerk what is the verified vote? On this question there are 96 'ayes' and 46 'nays' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 340. Read the Bill."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 340. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "On Senate Bill 340 ah.. Representative.... the Representative from ST. Claire, Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 340 would amend the Motor Vehicle Code to provide that ah.. carriers of property ah.. or of truckers be required to file with the Illinois Commerce Commission ah.. continuous bonds ah.. or a certificate that they are covered by insurance on a continuous basis. The law now reads that ah.. the ah.. they are bonded to a specific date thereby setting the responsibility or burden of proof ah.. of getting them when the ah... placing the responsibility on the I.C.C. to get it reinstated through a lot of administrative procedure, but under the Amendment the trucker would have to prove and keep on record a certificate a record that proves that he is bonded. And I move for the passage of this Bill."

Matijevich: "The question.... the Lady from St. Clair has moved the passage of Senate Bill 340. On the discussion of this Bill the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Tom Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Matijevich: "She indicates she will."



Deuster: "I heard you ah.. make reference to House Amendment #1, but I didn't clearly understand what it does. What does House Amendment #1 add or change to the Bill?"

Younge: "The Bill as ah... before the Amendment talked about insurance policies being on file, the Amendment says insurance certificates so that they won't have to actually let the policies lay with the Illinois Commerce Commission. All that is needed is a certificate."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "Is there any further questions? If not, on this question ah.. all those in favor of passage will vote 'aye' and those opposed shall signify by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are.... the Lady from ah... Geo-Karis, 'aye'. Representative Sharp. on this question there are 136 voting 'aye' and 0 voting 'nay' and 4 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 345. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 345. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

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

Matijevich: "Take that Bill out of the record. Is Representative Totten back ah.. ready for his Bill? Senate Bill 301 ah... where we had leave to return back to Senate Bill 301. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 301. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control..... no, that's the wrong one. Senate Bill 301. An Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten on Senate Bill 301."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I appreciate the leave you granted me. Senate Bill 301 amends the Illinois Housing Development Act and requires notice of each proposed project subject to



the approval of the authority to be given to the Members of the General Assembly and to municipalities, townships and counties in which the project may be located. It's similar to what NIPC does now for the Legislators. The Housing Authority does not ah.. opposed the legislation and I would ask for your favorable support."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the passage of Senate Bill 301. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor shall vote 'aye' and those opposed shall vote 'nay'. Shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mann, 'aye'. Take the record. On this Bill there are 135 voting 'aye' and 4 voting 'any' and 0 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the ah... Choate and Hart 'aye' and Berman 'aye'. This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 356."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 356. An Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative ah... the ah... excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Berman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might; I would ask that the House now stand in recess and that the Democrats retire to Room 113 for the purpose of a Democratic Conference and I think in line with the previous announcement that the House would then reconvene at 8:00, ah.. is that my understanding?"

Matijevich: "That's right."

Berman: "All right, then I would ask that we recess now and ah.. the Democrats retire to Room 113 for a Conference immediately and the House will reconvene at 8:00."

Matijevich: "We will take this Bill out of the record. The Democrats will retire to Room 113 and the Republicans will have a long dinner. We will return at 8:00 pm. The House stands in recess."

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

Bradley: "The House will be in order. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 458. A Bill for an Act to provide for the



ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Fair Agency. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 510. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. Senate Bill 860. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 958. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Fair Agency. First Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Representative Mann. Is Representative Ebbesen in the Chambers? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, for what purpose do you rise?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of inquiry. Is your intention to go to Third Reading?"

Bradley: "We're going to go to Agreed Resolutions and try to ah.. take some time so that more Members ah..."

Simms: "O'kay.... fine. You're not going to go on until we have more Membership. Thank you."

Bradley: "Agreed Resolutions. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 364, Sharp et al. House Resolution 365, Yourell. House Resolution 366, DiPrima et al."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 364 ah.. is in honor of Mr. O.A. Wilson Jr. who retired as Superintendent of Schools in Jersey County, Illinois on August 4, 1975. I would appreciate the adoption of this Resolution."

Bradley: "365, too."

DiPrima: "O'kay. House Resolution 365 has been brought to the attention of this Body that the Worth Volunteer Fire Department in Worth, Illinois celebrated its 50th anniversary on May 18th and ah.. I'd appreciate passing ah.. adopting this Resolution honoring the volunteer firemen of Worth, Illinois. And House Resolution 366 ah.. is ah.. makes this Body cognizant of the fact that though our involvement in the Viet Nam conflict is officially terminated there are many matters which still concern us as a nation and whereas primary among these factors effecting our conscience as Americans are those loyal and brave men who never returned home. I would appreciate the adoption of House Resolution 366."



Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 368, Dyer et al."

DiPrima: "This ah.. we mark with honor of Paul M. Bakis for his remarkable accomplishments at age 17, that he has attained as a senior at Hinsdale Central High School and I would appreciate the adoption of House Resolution 368."

Bradley: "The Gentleman offers the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye' and all opposed say 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments.... the Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 367 and House Joint Resolution 65."

Bradley: "Committee on Assignments. I think that the House had better stand at ease for a few moments until the Members return. Committee Reports."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which House Bill 1745, 3113 and 3114 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendations that the Bills do pass. Mr. Lechowicz from the Committee on Appropriations I to which Senate Bills 763, 813, 1499 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Lechowicz, from the Committee on Appropriations I to which Senate Bill 433 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bills as amended do pass. Mr. Lechowicz, from the Committee on Appropriations I to which House Bill 3054 was referred, recommended that the Bill be assigned to a Interim Study Calendar."

Bradley: "Introductions and First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3118. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Speaker's table with 3118. Messages from the Senate."

Jack 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 passed Bills of the following title and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Bills 347, 477 and 556 passed by the Senate June 16, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Bradley: "Committee Reports."



Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Boyle, from the Committee on Appropriations II to which House Bills 3034, 3059 and 3064 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendations that the Bills do pass. Mr. Boyle, from the Committee on Appropriations II, to which Senate Bill 658 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended do pass. Mr. Boyle, from the Committee on Appropriations II, to which Senate Bill 443 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do pass."

Bradley: "On the Calendar on Consideration Postponed appears Senate Bill 968. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs asks leave of the House to return Senate Bill 968 to Second Reading, Consideration Postponed for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? No objections being heard, the Bill is returned to Second Reading for the Amendment. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, amends Senate Bill 986 in the House on page 1, line 14 by deleting ah.... Amendment #1, amends Senate Bill 968 in the House on page 1, line 14 by deleting '1978 and inserting in lieu thereof '1977'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs on Amendment #1."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill itself was to extend two years the repealer of the waiver of liability with regard to blood transfusions. The Amendment reduces the two year repealer to ah.. extension of the repealer to one year. And as an Amendment agreed to with ah.. a number of Members including Representative G.L. Houlihan ah.. with regard to their objections to the Bill and I have accepted that Amendment. I move for your favorable consideration."

Bradley: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1....
The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "I have to apologize ah.. I didn't hear all of the explanation, but apparently you're cutting the two year extension down to one so



will this Act be extended basically until July 1, 1977?"

Downs: "Yes."

Kempiners: "O'kay ah... I understand the rational. Thank you."

Bradley: "Any further discussion? If none, the question is on the motion to adopt. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye' and the opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Bradley: "The Bill will go back on the Calendar on Third Reading ah... or on Consideration Postponed. Senate Bills, First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 347, Kosinski. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Training Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 477, McPartlin. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of General Services. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 556, Tipword. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Health. First Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Committee on Assignments. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer arise?"

Palmer: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "State your inquiry, Sir."

Palmer: "On the Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 3117. Ah... as of ah.. maybe an hour or an hour and a half ago this Bill was not printed. Can this Bill be moved to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day without that Bill having been printed and then distributed to all of the Members of the House?"

Bradley: "Wait until I find a copy of the Calendar. We have one. Sir, is your inquiry as to how the Bill can be on the Supplemental Calendar, First Legislative Day?"

Palmer: "Without the Bill being printed and distributed."

Bradley: "I understand that the Bill is not on the desk. We do not intend to read it today ah... until it is distributed."

Palmer: "Then as of tomorrow ah... if it is not printed and distributed, it will still remain on Second Reading, First Legislation Day?"



Bradley: "That's correct."

Palmer: "Thank you."

Bradley: "I understand tomorrow it will appear as House Bills, Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "That's my point, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "It will not be read at that time unless it is on your desk."

Palmer: "How can you move a Bill from one stage to another stage without it having been printed and placed on the desks? That's the basis of my inquiry."

Bradley: "It's not considered an other of business and it has to be on the Calendar for two days before we can read it so ah.. there's nothing that says that we can't do that without it being on your desk."

Palmer: "You mean without it actually being printed and distributed? That's the basis of the question."

Bradley: "Yes, Sir. We can do that."

Palmer: "Then the rule is that you can ah.. even though the Bill is not printed and distributed it can move up on the Second Legislative Day ah.. from First Reading to Second Reading?"

Bradley: "You let us determine that the Bill has not been printed. It's possible that it hasn't been distributed, but we're sure that the Bill has been printed in order to be on the Calendar right here. So if you'll give us some time to check on that, Mr. Palmer ah.. we're not going to move it from where it is right now. Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "As of about an hour or an hour and a half ago, it had not been printed. I checked on it upstairs, so ah..."

Bradley: "Well, let us ah.. would you give the Chair some time to check on that and we'll get back to you."

Palmer: "Sure."

Bradley: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. Now we're going to start off with Senate Bill 356 and that was where we were when we moved for a Democratic Conference. Is Mr. McLendon on the floor? McLendon ah... what I'm saying is that we're going to go down to the bottom of this page and we'll come back again because I know that this was very important to Mr. McLendon. Senate Bill 362. Is Mr. Fennessey ah.. the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Majority Leader, Mr. Shea."



Shea: "Mr. McLendon asked me if I might take that Bill for him ah.. and might I, Sir?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman ah... read for the third time ah.. Senate Bill 356."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 356. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Shea: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 356 expands that power of the Banking Commissioner when there's a change of ownership or control in a bank. And requires prior approval of the Commissioner of Banks. At the present time, if the control in a bank is changed ah.. before it is changed, the Commissioner must approve such change. This Bill would expand it to say that the change in the control of a holding company would be within the purvue of the Commissioner of Banks. And it defines control of 10% of the stock and other methods of having voting control. And I would move for the adoption of the Bill. It came out of Committee unamended and I see Mr. Schlickman looking at it and looking agast at the fact that I'm handling Bill, but I believe in the concept."

Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I just can't resist commenting that I'm surprised by the Sponsor of this Bill ah... temporary as he is, having such confidence in the Commissioner of Banks."

Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, you're not loosing your voice?"

Schlickman: "Yes, Sir."

Bradley: "We'll get some medical attention immediately. Does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea wish to close?"

Shea: "I'd like a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The question is shall Senate...."

Shea: "No, no. I see that we have some questions here."

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

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Meyer: "What does this do to present bank holding companies that are



grandfathered in under the ah.. present Act?"

Shea: "In what respect, Sir?"

Meyer: "Well, I'll be blunt and honest. I ah.. Pullman's Banking Group has the Heritage Chain that has thirteen banks. And in Beverly Bank Corporation in my district additionally has eleven banks."

Shea: "Neither one of those are controlled by a bank holding company, are they, Sir?"

Meyer: "No, they are bank holding companies."

Shea: "No, Sir. If you find that those are bank holding companies, they are contrary to Illinois law."

Meyer: "No, Sir. They are grandfathered in prior to the law."

Shea: "Are you telling me ah.. and I think perhaps you're right ah.. but as I understand the law, no holding company can hold more than 5% interest in a bank."

Meyer: "No, Sir. There are two bank holding companies and both are in the 28th District that ah..."

Shea: "Heritage and Pullman?"

Meyer: "Well, Heritage being the Pullman group and Beverly Bank in the Beverly Bank Corporation, but they're grandfathered in prior to the existing statute. What does that do to this?"

Shea: "You mean prior to this statute?"

Meyer: "No, prior to the Holding Company Act."

Shea: "All this Statute says, Sir, is that if the control of the holding companies changes hands, which in effect changes the control of the banks, that it must be approved by the Commissioner."

Meyer: "Could you take this out of the record for just one second, Jerry, please?"

Shea: "Well, if ah..."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, do you have a question?"

Shea: "Well, if it would make Mr. Meyer happier ah.. while Mr. Duff is asking a question if Mr. Meyer would come over, I would answer both either or all."

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

Duff: "Yes, Sir ah.. I have a question of the Sponsor."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield, Sir."



Duff: "Representative Shea, ah.. in the Bill as it was drafted it says that a holding company doesn't specify any such words as a bank holding company ah... and my first question; are the words, 'holding company and bank holding company' in your opinion distinguishable as a statutory matter?"

Shea: "Absolutely."

Duff: "Well, this particular Amendment does not say bank holding company, it says holding company. Isn't that correct?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir, because the bank holding company would be included in the language of a holding company and I happen to be a majority holder in a holding company that controls a bank. Now that holding company would not necessarily have as its major business, a bank."

Duff: "All right."

Shea: "But it could have the majority voting or the voting control in a bank."

Duff: "Right. All right, then if I might ask the question this way. Ah.. let's take Continental National American Financial Holding Company, which has assets in the billions of dollars, Representative Shea, ah..."

Shea: "I'm listening, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "O'kay. Let's take Continental National American Financial Holding Company, which has assets in billions, which controls several giant insurance companies like Continental Casualty Company, National Fire Insurance Company, Continental Insurance Company and many many other giants, and that particular holding company also owns the State Bank on the corner of Michigan....."

Shea: "Illinois State Bank, Sir.... it's on the corner of ah.."

Duff: "Ya, Illinois State Bank..."

Shea: "Michigan and Jackson."

Duff: "Right. Now that bank is a very very minute part of the total holdings of that company. Ah...."

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Duff: "Nevertheless, that holding company holds that bank. Would the change in control of Continental National American Financial Corporation or let's take All State Insurance Company or State Farm Insurance Company, or any other giant financial institution that might also own



control of a state bank and might properly and normally come under either the egis of the Security Exchange Commission or the Department of Insurance in Illinois because of the fact that they hold a bank also come under the need for approval of the Banking Commissioner?"

Shea: "Absolutely."

Duff: "If I may address myself to the Bill."

Shea: "Might I answer your question a little further, Sir?"

Duff: "Please."

Shea: "If you had the prior approval of the Department of Insurance and the S.E.C. for a change of 10% or more control in All State Insurance Company, which is owned by Sears or C.N.A. as we just had here ah.. recently; if you don't think that once that was approved by the Commissioner of Banks ah... I mean the Commissioner of Insurance and the S.E.C. ah.. do you think that the Commissioner of Banks would have any objections to it?"

Duff: "Well, I might respond to the question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that the question itself valors the need ah.. if indeed the F.E.C. and the Director of Insurance had approved ah.. then why must it at all be necessary to seek the approval of the Director ah.. the Commissioner of Banking?"

Shea: "Because you, Sir, pick out the two holding companies if you're talking holding companies ah.. whose stock transfers would require the prior approval of the Department of Insurance and or the prior approval of the F.E.C. and or the prior approval of the Securities Commissioner of the State of Illinois, but I want to tell you that if Mr. Schlickman and I started a holding company tomorrow each owning 100% of the 'A' stock and 100% of the 'B' stock and we decided to sell it all to you and change the complete control of that bank, which we owned 80% of the stock in, that the Commissioner would not have a thing to say. But under this Bill when he sought to take ah... when we sought to sell, in effect, the working control of that bank, he would have an effective voice in saying ah... not about the holding company so much, but about the effective control and transfer of the bank stock."

Duff: "Is that an offer of your stock, Mr. Shea?"

Shea: "Sir, if you're willing to pay the price, it's for sale."



Duff: "All right, ah.. I would like to suggest then the answer of the Sponsor indicates the need for exemptions in the Bill."

Shea: If ah.. you want I would..."

Madigan: "Would you Gentlemen refrain from this dialogue across the floor?"

Duff: "No, that was directed at you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if I might address myself to the Bill."

Madigan: "You already have."

Duff: "No, Sir. I've simply asked questions of the Sponsor and I would like to address myself to the Bill, if I may."

Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Very simply, Mr. Speaker, I think that the responses of the Sponsor indicate that the Bill would allow the Banking Commissioner to control ah.. the most significant stock transfers of industry and financial institutions in this state on a whim if he choose to. It's true that if the F.E.C. and the Director of Insurance approved such transfers that the Banking Commissioner probably should and probably would, but he wouldn't need to. And I do suggest that the answers from the Sponsor indicate the need for exemptions to be made."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr Palmer."

Palmer: "Ya, ah.. if Mr. Shea will answer a question or two?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he'll yield."

Palmer: "Jerry, what ah.. I don't know much about banking ah.. apparently you do, but ah.. what would be the need of the Bill..... the Banking Commissioner ah.. having veto power over these controls ah... would be number one?"

Madigan: "Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Assume for a minute, Sir, ah.. that Mr. Schlickman and I owned a holding company, that we were ah... what might be considered in Illinois banking as undesirable for owning a bank. We then turned around and bought control of another holding company that had control of an Illinois bank. Under the present statutory limitations, before you can change control of a bank ah.. when you change absolute control, the Commissioner of Banks must approve or disapprove of that statutory change in control. You can now get around that by forming a holding



company and changing control through a holding company. All this does is let the Commissioner of Banks pierce what might be called the corporate veil and look at the real nature of the transaction, rather than the transaction on it's face."

Palmer: All right, thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "If I may suspend the appropriate rule and ask one more question?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Meyer: "Under present statute, if a holding company acquires another bank, need they get approval of the Commissioner?"

Shea: "Under the present statute, a holding company cannot acquire more than one bank or 5% in any one bank. Once it owns a majority or voting control in a bank ah.. except perhaps of the two exemptions that you named that I was not familiar with, Sir."

Meyer: "There are three holding companies. Union National Bank has one. Beverly Bank has one and Pullman Bank has one. Now if they ah.. if they ah.."

Shea: "All right, you think there are not more than three?"

Meyer: "Well, I know that there are three in my district that are grand-fathered out."

Shea: "I might just tell you Drovers is a holding company ah.. you know, and I happen to tell you that I own control of a holding company called Blackhawk Holding Company that at one time had control of a bank in Silvis, Illinois. Now we could have sold control in that holding company to Mr. Schlickman or to Mr. Meyer....."

Meyer: "Is this a good Bill?"

Shea: "Yes. I fought it in Committee until I had a chance to talk to the Commissioner of Banks. I think it is an absolutely beautiful Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Jerry, would you yield to a question? Now as I understand it, ah... now Jerry, about downstate and that's what I'm particularly interested in; now a holding company ah... do you know of any holding company that's trying to get control of any State Bank downstate as yet?"



Shea: "No, Sir."

Borchers: "Would this be would this be to the advantage of downstate banks?"

Shea: "Yes."

Borchers: "It just so happens that I am a stock holder in a state bank downstate. This would help prevent a holding company from getting control of a local state bank?"

Shea: "Yes."

Borchers: "I would like to speak in favor of this Bill. I want to assure myself of this point. Downstate has still ah.. many state banks. They are not ah... they don't have a tremendous numbers of dollars ah... millions of dollars like other banks in Chicago, but maybe a couple million ah.. four or five or six million, but they're in little towns. And these banks are owned by ah.. farming ah.. most of them are farmers ah.. business people in these small towns. And I think that we would greatly fear a powerful bank or holding company out of Chicago to be able to get control of our banks and help control the local industry, the local business enterprizes ah.. such as our farming industry. So I feel that this is a step in protection of the state banks downstate and therefore, I would urge support of this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

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

Madigan: "The question is shall the main question now be put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the main question shall now be put. The question is shall Senate Bill 356 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes' and 4 'no' and 19 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 356 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 362. Mr. Fennessey... is Mr. Fennessey on the floor? Take that out of the record. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 364."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 364. A Bill for an Act relating to regulating



the handling of eggs and egg products. Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 364 provides for the establishing of standards for grading and classification of shell eggs for inspection during position of fees and a disposition thereof. The Egg Product Act has four main objections. One, is to provide uniformity of standards. Two, to provide for the inspection of eggs and egg products. Three, to place restrictions upon a disposition of certain quality of egg in a product. Four, to regulate the processing, handling, labeling and distribution of egg and egg products. I ah... would be happy to answer any questions and I would ask for a favor Roll Call on a piece of legislation that I think is needed by the Department of Agriculture to insure that we continue ah.. to have uniform, fresh egg and egg products in the State of Illinois. I can't say that we've always had that ah.. under all of the conditions and I think that this would give the Department of Agriculture the authority to make sure that everybody is receiving fresh eggs in Illinois."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm told that this is the 187th licensing ah.. profession that we will have in this state if this Bill passes. Judging from the State Sponsorship, I'd say that it had a fair chance too, which I am not happy to see. This is ah.. as with so many other things, is ah.. like landscape architect licensing, geologists, tree surgeons ah.. and so many other things, you don't ever hear about a need for them until it is presented to in a form of a Bill. I have no idea as to the ah.... what was that? Ah... exterminators also ah.. I'm told ah.. we're attempting to license them. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, nine times out of ten ah.. and I think this fits very nicely within the nine, we are licesning people so that we can protect that profession. So that we can make the service for this profession cost more to the consumer. So that in this day, we can pay more for eggs than we pay now. I don't recall any great human cry over bad eggs that we've had ah.... with the exception of the other side of the aisle, that is. I suggest to



to you that there is no crying need for this Bill. There is no crying need to license egg inspectors anymore than there is to license landscape architects or to license geologists or any number of other things that we've had come before us. It's going to cost people more for eggs in this case and other services in other cases and I would ask you to vote 'no'."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

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

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he'll yield."

Berman: "Representative Bradley, there was some Bills dealing with the milk inspection ah.. is the same Bill or is this on a different subject?"

Bradley: "As far as my knowledge ah.. it's not the same Bill, Sir."

Berman: "Does this effect ah.. anything to do with the Board of Health in Chicago?"

Bradley: "No, Sir."

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

Simms: "Ah.. Mr. Speaker, a question of the chair. Ah.. will this Bill take 107 ah.. votes being a preemption of the home rule powers of the municipality?"

Madigan: "Did you address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?"

Simms: "Yes."

Madigan: "Could you point to the Chair the Sections of the Bill that you feel are preemptive and would the Clerk give me a copy of the Bill?"

Simms: "Well, you should have a copy of the Bill ah.. at the Clerk's desk, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Well, I do and now would you point out the Sections?"

Simms: "Well, I'm asking the question ah.. since you are setting up a licensing agency to license ah... and other licensing Bills have had the home rule preemption that was placed on it and I note that this Bill does not have. And since there are people that sell eggs and egg products ah.. in the City of Chicago or other home rule municipalities, I would wonder if this would require a 60% vote of the Assembly."

Madigan: "Mr. Simms, have you found the Sections of the statue that you



feel are preemptive?"

Simms: "Well, ah... I'm conferring here with my legal council here from Lake."

Madigan: "Gentlemen, could I make a suggestion ah.. that we take this Bill out of the record and then come right back to it? Go on to the next Bill. Mr. Bradley, we'll take it out of the record to ah.. determine a ruling on this paramount issue."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, if I might ah... I thought the Minority ah.... Assistant Minority Leader ah.... he made a very poor yoke over there a while ago and I was going to respond to that."

Madigan: "Let's go on to the next Bill so that on the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 382. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 382. A Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is sponsored by Senator Berning of the Senate is essentially the same as my Salmon Stamp Bill that was previously passed in the House. There are a few minor exemptions to it. In one instance, the money will be divided ah... 50% between the Fish and Game Fund and 50% with the Boating Fund, rather than going into the exclusive development of salmon. I would urge the passage of this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Would the Gentleman from Lake, yield to a question?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Pierce: "Mr. Griesheimer, as I recall ah.. your Bill had a smelt problem. It included smelt and we had to take smelt out and ah... and then approved the Bill. Now does this Bill by Senator Berning ah... has this got smelt out? Are we only regulating ah.. salmon and salmon only and whatever here and ah.. not smelt?"

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Pierce, as you know, the Legislature has been gifted with the expert in this subject and ah... our head smelt Legislator ah.. representing the smelt lobby, Mr. Houlihan, took care of that situation in Committee."



JUN 17 1975

135.

Pierce: "So the Bill as it now stands is only salmon stamp. I think that it's a good Bill.. It recognizes ah... the role of Northeastern Illinois as the salmon center of the United States and especially Waukegan as the salmon capital of the United States. And therefore, I am going to support the Bill, which was approved already by the ah... by the most industrious Committee in the House, the Committee on Environmental Energy and Natural Resources down in the broom closet."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "If necessary, I move the previous question."

Madigan: "There's no one else seeking to ah.. debate this issue, but Mr. Schlickman has indicated that he wishes to delay the process. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose this Bill not because I'm a fisherman or having any interest in fishing, but I don't like this kind of tax, which is an addition to an already existing tax and that one half the proceeds of this tax will go to the Game and Fish Fund and absolutely no relationship necessarily between the fishing of salmon or trout. And one half of the proceeds will go into another special fund, which has no relationship to the fishing in Lake Michigan. I think it's a means that has been arrived at to serve some special interests, but I just don't see a relationship between the activity that's being taxed and the benefits that are attempting to be promoted. I think once and for all, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we should rise up in opposition to special taxation for unrelated purposes. And if the motion of a special fund that is set us and more often then not ah.. these kind of funds have more proceeds unexpended in them. I urge a 'no' vote on Senate Bill 382."

Madigan: "There being no further discussion, ah.. the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer to close the debate."

Griesheimer: "I would only urge the House to vote in favor of this Bill and remind you also that I am still awaiting your reservations for the salmon outing on July 20th and 21st in Lake County in Waukegan and urge you to get those in immediately. I would urge your favorable vote on this Bill."



Madigan: "The question is shall Senate Bill 382 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes' and 22 'no' and 5 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 382 having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. We will now return on the Calendar to Senate Bills, Third Reading, Senate Bill 364. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker...."

Madigan: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, addressed the Chair with a parliamentary inquiry regarding the question as to whether Senate Bill 382 ah.. strike that.... whether Senate Bill 364 would be preemptive of home rule units. The Chair has examined the Bill and the Chair rules that it will require 89 votes to pass Senate Bill 364. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We were in the midst of debate on Senate Bill 364 when the request was made. And let me say this to you, that we are not doing anything ah.. this is not a licensing Bill at all. We're not doing anything that ah...that ah.. hasn't presently been done, but we are trying to bring our state law into conformity with the federal law and also with the law of the states that are surrounding the State of Illinois. This Bill rewrites the Chapter 56 ah.. of an ah.. and the Act regulating the handling, sale and processing of eggs and egg products and repeals part of it. So we're really bringing into conformity with federal law and we do have ah... we do import more eggs into the State of Illinois than we export. And some of them are coming in here in not the kind of condition that we would like to see them and we don't have the ability ah.. without this law, to make sure that they are inspected. So if there aren't any more questions ah.. or if there are I would be glad to answer them. If there aren't, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."



Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor is exactly right. There's nothing new about licensing people who buy eggs. This has been going on for at least thirty years, that I know of and this is some protection for those eggs that come in from out of state. That's all it does."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he'll yield. The Sponsor indicates that he will not answer any questions from Representative Tipsword."

And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have one question that I would like to ask if the ah..."

Madigan: "I don't know if he'll answer it."

Leinenweber: "Representative Bradley..."

Madigan: "Will you answer a question, Representative Bradley?"

Bradley: "Well, let's hear the question."

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he'll yield."

Leinenweber: "All right. There has appeared on the market ah.. in recent years or the last few years ah.. these cholesterol free egg mixes that you just pour on the batter. Now does this Bill outlaw that? And does it regulate that? Or does it leave it alone?"

Bradley: "It regulates it."

Leinenweber: "How does it regulate it?"

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "I just want to ask a quick question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield."

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Deuster: "The question is this ah... we've got ah.... it looks like a new Act and about twenty pages and I assume that there will be some inspecting of the egg producers and I was wondering is there an estimate on how many additional of the Department of Agriculture will be required, if any, in order to effectively administer this Act? And what costs might be involved?"

Bradley: "For the Department of Agriculture to implement this piece of legislation ah.. is that your question, Sir?"



Deuster: "Ah.. yes, will the Department of Agriculture need more employees and if so how many? And what would be the cost of ah.. enforcing this Act? Or are just going to take the same employees and enforce some new regulations or definitions?"

Bradley: "Well, ah.. yes ah... the answer is ah.. the department is already inspecting and this is going to broaden their inspection powers and so it's going to take ah... an estimated four or five employees to ah.. to do this."

Deuster: "Is that in the budget ah.. the four or five employees?"

Bradley: "Well, in the Bill also ah.. you'll see that there is the requirement for a charge for the inspection and we expect that to produce to the department ah.. approximately \$60,000. And we anticipate that that will pay for the employees."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Madigan: "The Speaker indicates that he will yield."

Taylor: "Representative Bradley, I was looking through the Bill and I don't quite understand it. I wonder what is an adulterated egg?"

Bradley: "An adulterated egg is a bad egg."

Madigan: "There being no further discussion, the question is shall Senate Bill 364 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 'ayes' and 31 'no' and 8 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 364 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 383. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Senate Bill 383. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Soeaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 383 makes a clear distinction in the Criminal Code between the offense of reckless homicide and ah..: involuntary manslaughter. Under the present



law, the States Attorney may proceed under either or both and there have been cases in which they've been claiming that...a...its unequal protection of the law and denial of due process the courts have sustained the statute. What this Bill does is make a distinction, it requires that under the involuntary manslaughter, it'd clearly be unintentional. It provides that homicide by automobiles with the statute shall be called reckless homicide except in the cases of murder. I know of no opposition to it, its a clarifying statute in the sense and does, in a sense, require or provide for due process. I urge your support."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the sponsor yield?"

Madigan: "The sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Ebbesen: "Representative Washington, what is the difference between the Class IV felony as far as penalty and Class A misdemeanor?"

Washington: "Well that part of the digest is incorrect. Now they're both Class IV felonies."

Ebbesen: "Okay, there's no change."

Washington: "No change. In the original Act there was a change, but with the Senate sponsor's suggestion that at the assistance of the Judiciary II Committee...a...it was returned to a Class IV mis....a...felony."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

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

Madigan: "The sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Griesheimer: "Just for clarification, Mr. Washington, on this...a...a... if the...a...a...individual using an automobile does kill another one, are you saying that it is necessary to show that he killed that person with intent to make it reckless homicide?"

Washington: "No, no, no. That would clearly, under this Act, come under the...a...reckless homicide. If he did it with intent, that would be a question of murder and that would become under the murder section."

Griesheimer: "Alright, that's my understanding. Speaking to the Bill very



briefly...a...I was contacted by the States Attorney's office in Lake County and I know that they have had tremendous problems in making proper charges and upholding them in the courts, especially on appeal. This is a very much needed...a...change in correction and clarification in our statutes and I would urge its passage."

Madigan: "There being no further discussion, the question is shall Senate Bill 383 pass. All those in favor signify by voting aye. All those opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Will someone push Lechowicz's switch aye? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 153 ayes, 5 noes, no voting present, and Senate Bill 383 having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills' Third Reading appears Senate Bill 392."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill..."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Fred Selcke: "A...Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave to bring this back to the order of Second Reading."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Mr. Beaupre, our friend, Mr. Skinner, has objected."

Beaupre: "Well, I can't imagine why the Representative Skinner would object to bringing this Bill back. I would like to point out to the Members of the House that late last week, I believe on Friday, while I was off the floor on another matter...this Bill was brought back to the order of Second Reading with leave of the House and an Amendment was considered which I opposed. That Amendment was adopted apparently without any discussion and the Bill moved on to Third Reading. It is my intention at this point to at least have the issue of whether or not this Amendment should be adopted, debated on the House floor. And I would ask Representative Skinner to respectfully withdraw his objection."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well I have the dubious honor of being the Republican spokesman on the Motor Vehicles Committee and if there is a change to be made in



the Bill, I'd be happy to discuss it with him, but in my present state, I'm not sure I can grasp the content of the Amendment he wants to take off without speaking to him in person."

Beaupre: "Well there's only one Amendment on the Bill, Representative Skinner, and what that Amendment does is that it allows trucks to travel at the same speed limit...."

Skinner: "I withdraw my Amendment...my objection."

Madigan: "Leave having been granted, Senate Bill 393 shall be placed on the order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there Amendments filed for Senate Bill 392? Senate Bill 392 having been placed on the order of Second Reading, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at this time I would move to table Amendment #1 and I'll speak to that motion."

Madigan: "Mr. Beaupre, was that Amendment adopted?"

Beaupre: "That is correct."

Madigan: "Well, Mr. Beaupre, we would have to have someone who voted on the prevailing side move to reconsider the vote. And Mr. Schraeder... a...the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing...I...I...vote... I make a motion that we move to reconsider the vote by which the Amendment was adopted."

Madigan: "The question is shall the...the question is shall the vote by which Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 392 was adopted, shall that vote be reconsidered. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? The ayes have it and the vote has been reconsidered and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, since there was also a Senate Amendment on that Bill, I think for the record, that you ought to indicate that we move to reconsider the vote by which House Amendment was taken."

Madigan: "Well Mr. Madison, we would not have the power to remove a Senate Amendment, it became part of the Bill once it left the Senate, once it was adopted by the Senate, Representative, it became part of the Bill, but thank you for your noting of that. Let the record show



that it was House Amendment #1. And for what purpose does Mr. VanDuyne arise?"

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, is there any procedure of this House whereby we may amend this to put our speed limit back to seventy-five miles an hour? If there is, I'd go to the all the ends of the earth to, you know, uncover it or try to line up some support or whatever."

Madigan: "We'll let Mr. Beaupre answer that question. The Chair recognizes Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while many of us may very well be sympathetic to Representative VanDuyne's suggestion, that of course, is not germane to the issue at hand. The issue at hand is, and I hope that all of you will listen because I think this is something that you may very well be held accountable to when you get home. Mr. Speaker, may we have order in the chamber?"

Madigan: "Will the Membership please give Mr. Beaupre their attention? This is a very important Bill."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this may not be the most earth shaking...a..a...issue that will become before the General Assembly this session, but I would guarantee you that it is one that you are going to be accountable to when ... to your constituents when you get back home this summer. Amendment #1, which was offered and adopted by this House, in which I'm asking you to strike off the Bill, is the Amendment which allows trucks over 8000 pounds to travel at the same speed limit as private passenger automobiles. I would submit to you that if you want to be on your way back to Chicago or St. Louis or wherever you may be from, you want to be viewing through the back-view mirror these demons bearing down upon you on the highway going at a rate of speed of ten or fifteen miles an hour faster than you are, that we ought to leave this Amendment on. But I would also point out to you that, for instance, the military who has a great deal of experience in convoys and speed limits and so forth, has for many, many years advocated that heavy truck...and...and large vehicle travel at a speed limit which is lower than the rate traveled by normal vehicles such as private passenger automobiles. I would submit to you that the people in your district would be



very unhappy if you voted for a measure which would extend the fifty-five mile an hour speed limit indefinitely until Congress took it off and to allow trucks to travel at the same speed. We know, for instance, that there are many two-lane highways in this State. It isn't always the case that we have an opportunity to travel our super expressways and that when you get on those two-lane highways and you have those large trucks travelling at the same speed that you do, that you create a safety factor which is the kind of thing that I don't believe we want to impose upon the public in the State of Illinois. I personally oppose this Amendment to allow trucks to travel at the same speed and I hope that you agree with me and I would like to have this matter considered and I would hope that you would vote the Amendment down."

Madigan: "Mr Beaupre, have you moved to table House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 392?"

Beaupre: "I have indeed."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the sponsor of this motion yield to a question?"

Madigan: "The sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Friedrich: "If this Amendment is taken off, what will be the speed limit of trucks?"

Beaupre: "The speed limit of trucks will be fifty miles per hour, which is what it is right now."

Friedrich: "Well then may I just make this one comment. The speed limit for trucks have been fifty-five miles an hour continuously, even on super highways when we could go seventy mile an hour. I think this Amendment should be left off."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. A...can you tell me how we can reconsider a voice vote on this to take it back?"

Madigan: "Mr. Giglio, you are correct, it was a voice vote, which adopted the Amendment and Mr. Schraeder has stated to us, in good faith, that he voted on the prevailing side that adopted that Amendment and I, for one, am not willing to question Mr. Schraeder's good faith. Maybe you are, but I'm not."



Giglio: "No I'm not. Well, can I speak in opposition to the proposal here?"

Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Well I was the bad boy that put the Amendment on and...I can honestly say that I think the trucking industry, as it now stands, that they're penalized enough and I can't see why, with the fifty-five mile an hour speed limit....can't I talk against the Bill?"

Madigan: "Will the Gentlemen give Mr. Giglio their attention? For what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, arise?"

Hudson: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is there a motion before the House to table the Amendment?"

Madigan: "Yes there is."

Hudson: "Is that a debateable motion? I didn't think it was."

Madigan: "Well I'll have to consult with the Parliamentarian. If he's within ear shot, I wish he'd come out here."

Hudson: "Well a motion to table, I thought, was undebateable. I may be wrong on that."

Madigan: "If the Parliamentarian is available, I wish he'd come out here. Because of the controversy regarding this motion, we'll take this Bill out of the record until we've resolved that parliamentary inquiry and we will go to Senate Bills' Third Reading. Senate Bill 362, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey. And for what purpose does the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, arise?"

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I see Senator Lemke up there on the podium. I wonder if he was President...present in the Senate when Senator Sevikas gave his speech on dress. And deploring the idea that House Members come over to the Senate with their neckties loose and not dressed in proper order. And I would appreciate if you would consult with Senator Sevikas and when you come over here, to have your necktie tight around your neck, very tight."

Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we've found the section of the rule book which relates to the parliamentary inquiry of Mr. Hudson so that we will return...we will take Senate Bill 362 out of the record and we will return to Senate Bill 392. And the Robert's Rules of Order provide that a motion to lay on the table is not debateable, therefore



the question is the motion of Representative Beaupre to lay House Amendment #1 to Senate 392 on the table. All those in favor will signify by voting aye. All those opposed by voting no. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Chairman, Members of the House. I'd like to explain my no vote. I know something about trucks and how they travel on the road and I'm sure all of you do. And if they are travelling at the same speed of cars, they certainly are not as much trouble as they are travelling ahead. I'd like to see the Amendment fail and I'd urge a no vote on this."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, to explain his vote."

Giglio: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is a good Amendment and I think one of the reasons why we didn't hear any opposition last week is because the Secretary of State, Teamsters Union, the...a...State Police are all in favor of this Amendment. For safety reasons they feel that the traffic moving on the highway when they move in an orderly fashion is more safety-wise than those that are not. And I think for the trucking industry, one industry in this country that is not subsidized like the railroads, needs this Bill. Not only with the energy crisis that we have, but with the things that have happened in thirty-three other states and Illinois being the crossroad State in this country for the transportation of goods and services, they're are penalized now by not having the same increase in weights as thirty-three other states in this country. And its a proven fact that if these extra weights don't tear up the roads and to visual strengthening parts of my statement here can be proven on the Dan Ryan when you look on the four lanes where the cars travel and you look on the auto-drive where the cars travel and not the trucks, those things are tore up and they're not tore up by the weights of the trucks. I think this is a good Amendment and I think everybody should vote no."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers, to explain his vote. Would the Membership give Mr. Deavers their



attention?"

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, in explaining my vote, I'd like to correct the last speaker. I'm voting with him. I think his Bill is right, but when he got up and insulted my railroads and saying they were subsidized, that Bill did not pass, I was attempting to subsidize. Now the subsidy is to those airports and airplanes and the riverboats and things of that nature, but these poor truckers need a little help and this is a good Bill and I think you ought to support it."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne. Mr. Van Duyne...to explain his vote."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, maybe I'm slightly confused. I was just informed by Representative Mudd that this Amendment makes it the same speed for trucks as it does for cars, fifty=five miles an hour. I was under the impression that Mr. Beaupre wanted this reduced down to fifty miles an hour. Is that true? Now you could clarify this for me if you would."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the...the...."

VanDuyne: "...well then Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have Mudd do this...through my own conscience and my own feable...."

Madigan: "Mr. VanDuyne,.....a...there are others who wish to explain their vote and will explain it to you in their explanation of their vote. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, who will attempt to answer Mr. VanDuyne's question."

Griehseimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, but I wouldn't attempt to answer Mr. VanDuyne's question. I'm sure someone with far more expertise than I would have to do that. I merely wish to arise to explain my vote on this and in so doing make mention to Mr. Beaupre that as of this week, having just recently equipped my car with a Citizens' Band Radio I find that the truckers are our friends, not our enemies. I knew where Smokey Bear was all the way down from Waukegan and I think we should keep our friends close to us. I do not think we should make them hide behind us and in that way we can always know where Smokey is and no matter where we are in the United States."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Craig,



to explain his vote."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment that was placed on this Bill makes it a uniform speed of which the Uniform Speed Bill has been in this House before when it was seventy miles on inter...on the interstate and this here uniform speed in the states that have uniformed speed if you please, with all that hullabaloo that you read in the press and all of these things about that, they can prove to you in facts and figures where there's not near as many head on collisions from passing or many rear-end collisions where people come up behind and things like that. And they can prove to you that their accident rate has went down to...as our neighboring state of Indiana. Now if you talk about safety, if you try to pass and truck and you stay legal runnin fifty-five miles an hour and they're runnin fifty on a two lane slab, you are gonna be out there just short of a mile in order to pass that truck. Now if you think you are in safe conditions out there in that left hand lane passing a truck for almost a mile, running legal, you've got a different opinion from anybody else as far as safety's concerned. The Department of Transportation is very much and strongly in favor of this Bill for safety reasons. And I want to say this. It's funny to me that a lot of you people that will vote that way on other issues and here is a trucking industry, I'm not talkin' about bein subsidized, but here is a trucking industry, someone who is making tax dollars, who's payin their own way and we can't give them a five mile break, but we can pass all the other limitations on them that we want, and that's fine, but I'll say to you people here in this General Assembly if you think there's anything more important that the truckin industry to tie up this country for which you saw done last...about a year ago when they went to Washington and they have advocated that and I think this Amendment should be kept on this Bill for safety reasons and benefit to all of us. Thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "No, I just want a point of order. I'm so completely confused I don't know if I'm on the road or off the road. Now, what is the darn amendment



about? What is it...what are we...what are we voting on?"

Madigan: "The question is shall the House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 392 be tabled?"

Geo-Karis: "Be tabled? The House Amendment...well what is House Amendment #1?"

Madigan: "And to explain that the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, the Chairman of the Motor Vehicles Committee, Mr. Londrigan. Mr. Londrigan, for the edification of all here, would you please explain what the Amendment did?"

Londrigan: "I think a better approach to it would be if you vote red you are voting for fifty-five mile an hour, if you vote green, you are voting for fifty miles an hour. And that's where the confusion is. Now I would remind the House that we already voted out of this House a fifty-five mile an hour speed law for trucks. So that vote up there is reversing the previous Roll Call. So those of you who previously voted for a fifty-five mile an hour for trucks should reconsider their vote. Now we heard in Motor Vehicles Committee and it was debated on the House that the Department of Transportation and the State Police have said that safety and economics says that we could go to fifty-five mile an hour for trucks and that's why we passed the votes before us. So if you are going to take this testimony in the previous vote, you could vote red. The only reason I could see that you would vote green is because the sponsor apparently does not want this Bill, the speed limit, on his Amendment. But I would suggest that we could be consistent, we couldn't have voted through the fifty-five mile an hour unless we are willing to put it on this Bill too. And I would suggest that we change our vote to no because I think the trucks should, for safety and economic reason, be able to go to fifty-five miles an hour."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Stevenson, Mr. Brinkmeier, to explain his vote."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to support the remarks of the previous speaker. Now I traveled two hundred miles to get to Springfield each week, most of it on two lane highways. And I want to assure you that if a truck is driving



fifty miles per hour and you don't exceed the fifty-five mile per hour speed limit, there's practically no way you are going to get around that truck. Secondly, on the conservation of energy, there's no question in my mind in talking with the drivers of trucks that if they are...if they are restricted to the fifty mile per hour speed limit, they are burning more gasoline, probably than they are when they are permitted to drive the fifty-five mile per hour. So on the basis of safety and on the basis of fuel conservation, I would urge you to reconsider and put the red light on that board because I think they should be allowed to go the same speed as everyone else."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, there might be a couple of reasons for voting in favor of this. Number one, all the trucks are already going fifty-five miles an hour and if you give them the legal limit to go fifty-five miles an hour, they'll probably be going sixty to sixty-five to seventy as they were, as they have been on every trip I have made between Springfield and Crystal Lake in the last two months. A better reason, perhaps, would be that this Amendment was not considered in Committee. In fact, I personally saw Senator Charles Chew tear it up and throw it away."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, to explain his vote."

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we sit and talk about whether trucks should go fifty-five or whether cars should go fifty-five. The speed limit is fifty-five miles an hour on our highways. If highway...or if cars and trucks could go the same way and the State Police would enforce the laws, I think it would solve most of the problems."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword, to explain his vote."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote, I want to ask a question of the Chair. A...this House Amendment was adopted some time ago and I see it's explained in our synopsis. And I would like to know why...a...an Amendment as important as this that changes the total aspect of this Bill that's described in our synopsis as a



technical correction."

Madigan: "Mr. Tipword, I don't have the answer to your question, possibly someone in the Reference Bureau could answer the question. They drafted it. The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, to explain her vote. No. Mr. Mudd, do you wish to explain your vote? Mr. Yourell? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, I briefly want to say that I am as guilty as anybody else that exceeds the posted fifty-five mile an hour speed limit on our highways in the State of Illinois and in other states and I think that if anybody who votes green to table this Amendment and exceeds the posted speed limit, as I suppose fifty percent of those green lights do, then how in the world in good conscience can you vote to curtail the truck traffic's speed limit. So I'd ask you to examine your conscience if you go fifty-five, as Mr. Beaupre does, because on most occasions, I pass him going like hell and I know that he's going fifty-five. He has a legitimate reason for doing what he's doing, but I venture to guess, and its strictly a guess, that fifty percent of those green lights are phony lights and should be present or no."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most all of the discussion here I've agreed with as to opposing doing away with this Amendment, but one of the things that has not been mentioned that the so called C.B.'s know about is the eighteen wheelers the truckers cannot get in high geared when at fifty miles an hour. They are running in a gear lower than high gear. We talk about saving energy, we are not saving energy with a fifty-five mile...fifty mile an hour limit. In fact, the average truck has to run about fifty-eight miles an hour to get into high gear. I would would like, while I have the floor, to welcome Representative Griesheimer to the C.B. Club with Hog Dog VanDuyne and Little Joe Mudd and myself."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, to explain his vote."

Kosinski: "If the Chair could give me some order I might."

Madigan: "Would the Membership give Mr. Kosinski their attention? He won't speak until you do."

Kosinski: "Members of the House, its been an excellent dinner hasn't it? Would you please listen for a minute? Mr. Speaker, I cannot address this House, would you please give me order?"

Madigan: "I'll try. Ladies and Gentlemen, would everyone please give their attention to Mr. Kosinski? He promises to say something different than has already been said before."

Kosinski: "I think that the great deal of confusion, I repeat there's a great deal of confusion in terms of this Amendment. It's my feeling and possibly every driver on the road, that I won't...I don't want trucks travelling at the same speeds that I travel because their stopping power is much less than yours and mine. I don't want them sliding through us when we stop quickly. Now I repeat I think there is confusion on this Amendment. I want trucks to travel slower than I do because I can stop fast. And if you are confused and if you agree with me, you should have a green light on that board because trucks should not travel at the same speed we travel. Now this is only logic and if you are listening I ask you for your green light."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli, to explain his vote."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I rise..."

Madigan: "...let me get some order for you Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "...there's enough order, thank you. My dear friend, Mr. Giglio, said he was a bad boy to put the Amendment on. Not only was he a bad boy, but he put a bad Amendment on a good Bill, he made it worse. He says that truck can travel as fast as we can and I'm sure that all of you have travelled when trucks are in front of you on rainy nights when they were throwing the stones up in your windshield and you can't see because your windshiled wipers don't work as fast as they should and I would suggest a green light and kill this very bad Amendment."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to



explain his vote."

Marovitz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't know what happened in the last ten minutes to take twenty-five votes off the green lights. I didn't hear anything that could change twenty-five votes. This had ninety-five green votes before and all of a sudden it has seventy-four. For safety purposes, we ought to have a lot more green lights up there. All I know is that if you want to pass a truck, especially with the sizes of many of the trucks on our highway today, I want to make sure that that truck is going a little bit slower than I am so that if I'm proceeding legally, which many of us and I would include myself, don't on many occasions. But if we are proceeding legally so we can pass that truck and still be safe and keep the other people on the highways safe, this is a terrible, terrible Amendment, everybody thought it was a terrible Amendment ten minutes ago and now all of a sudden, we see a lot of red lights up there and I don't understand it. I think if we are concerned about safety on the highway and about passing these big trucks and making sure that other people are safe, we have to vote green on this. And think about it, its a simple issue, we want to have safety on our highways or not, and why should trucks be able to be going as fast as we are, they've been going fifty, now why change it now and why should the green lights be coming down. Let's bring them up and defeat this terrible Amendment."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like toa...if someone in explaining their vote, perhaps the Speaker himself could, prior to the time that the conventional auto..."

Madigan: "Let's give our attention to Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "I don't think anybody really cares...Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could answer this. Prior to the time that we reduced the speed limit to fifty-five miles an hour, can somebody answer for me, was there a difference between the conventional automobile traveled and the trucks traveled? If there was, everything is relative and I think



since we reduced the speed limit to fifty-five, it should still be relative and everybody should be voting green on this particular proposal."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the comment that a... that...a...Representative Tipsword made because this Amendment...this Bill was called back to Second Reading last Thursday and this Amendment was placed on. Now the Amendment was described as a technical Amendment and even the digest suggests that it makes technical corrections. Now I, for one, resent the printing of the digest incorrectly and I'm not sure whether this was done inadvertently or on purpose, but this particular Amendment got relative little if any debate last Thursday and I'm glad to see it come up again for at least, debate this time. Thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief, but I think I would like to point out one thing. The sponsor wants the Amendment off of his Bill so he can pass it in the shape that he wants. I think he is entitled to that. Above and beyond the fact that the fifty-five mile an hour speed limit couldn't carry on its own merits so it was attached to another Bill, I think it ought to be taken off and run on its own merits and let Representative Beaupre run his Bill as he wants to run it in the shape he wants and I think he's entitled to that."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 87 ayes, 73 noes, 11 voting present...and for what purpose does the Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Craig, arise?"

Craig: "I'd like to ask for a verification."

Madigan: "And for what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, arise?"

Skinner: "I would like a poll of the absentees on this 'technical'



Amendment....and then a verification of the negative Roll Call."

Madigan: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Gene Hoffman. Ron Hoffman..."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, arise?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, can I make a parliamentary inquiry sir? Does it take a majority of those voting on the question to carry this motion?"

Madigan: "It's my understanding that it does, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Alright, do our rules provide that those present votes are considered voting and therefore it takes, right now, its 87-84. And I would like to inquire from the Chair before we start this. As I understand the rules that present votes are considered as voting for all...all questions except that of the Speaker."

Madigan: "It is my understand that Mr. Shea has correctly stated the rules. However, if the Parliamentarian is within ear shot, I'd appreciate it if he'd get out here. And for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz arise?"

Lechowicz: "I'd like to know what rules, we never adopted them."

Shea: "Now the temporary rules say that too, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: 'Yeh, I'd like to know where?"

Shea: "Well its right..."

Madigan: "Gentlemen, let's please refrain from this dialogue. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, arise?"

Walsh: "Well this is the first time in my experience that I've had anyone ever suggests that a present vote shall be counted as a negative vote on an Amendment. Now that is patently absurberd, Mr. Speaker, and you did not rule, did you, that that is the case?"

Madigan: "The Parliamentarian has arrived, let's all give him a round of applause. He's arrived. Now would Mr. Shea restate the question."

Shea: "As I understand, a motion takes a majority of those voting on the question to carry, that our rules..."

Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I would direct your attention to the temporary House Rules of the 79th General Assembly, Rule 54, which defines the vote of present and it states that 'except for the purposes of Rule 1, which is the election of officers, a Member who answers present shall be counted as voting'. And in the opinion of



the Parliamentarian, that means that for a question to carry, there must be a majority of those voting plus those voting present. Alright, there must be more ayes than the sum of the noes and the presents. So the ruling of the Chair is that for this question to carry there must be more ayes than the sum of the noes and the presents. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, arise?

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since that is the ruling, then I think that we ought to have another Roll Call because those people who are voting present ought to know that the effect of their vote is that they are voting no. So it...I think we ought to, Mr. Speaker..."

Madigan: "I think that is a good suggestion, Mr. Walsh, the Clerk will dump this Roll Call and we will take another Roll Call. The question is shall...for what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Spekaer, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before you made your ruling, I was trying to get attention because I think that before a ruling is made you have to listen and debate on the issue of the ruling. I'm not as concerned about this particular issue, but what your ruling will do in further issues. And I think in order to rule on this particular issue, you have to go to the intent of the House and the intent of the rules. I really don't think the intent of the rules were that the present vote should ever be determined on the matter of voting whether the majority shall rule on an aye and nay vote. I really think that the intent of the rules, when we adopted those rules, were that it ought to be the majority as to the ayes and nays. And Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to reconsider your ruling because of what it may do in future issues. We have to go to the heart of the intent of the Body and I was trying to get your attention your...your...attention on that matter. I...I realize that the Majority Leader was right when we go to the matter of the issue relating to the rules as they are written, but I would like to have you reconsider your ruling as it goes to the intent of the House and I would so ask you Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Well Mr. Matijevich, I agree with your definition of intent. However, the...the reading of the...or the language of the rules is



quite explicit and I would only make two suggestions. Let everyone vote yes or no or don't vote at all on this immediate question and let the Rules Committee meet early in the morning and draft an Amendment. And we will take a Roll Call...Ladies and Gentlemen, its five minutes to ten...for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, arise?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, if I saw that board correctly, the no votes and present votes were less than the aye votes and therefore, there should have been a ruling on the voting without any...or further...assuming.. your explanation you're correct and your interpretation was correct. There were more aye votes in spite of the combination of the present and therefore, I ask for a ruling..."

Madigan: "...Mr. Maragos, there was a request for a verification. And many people did not realize the effect of their present vote so we would like to take another Roll Call and the Clerk will take a Roll Call and the question is shall House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 392 be tabled. All those in favor signify by voting aye. All those opposed by voting no. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, arise?"

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I realize we've been on this crucial issue for over an hour and a half, are we going to dispense with explanation of votes now that we've taken this over?"

Madigan: "Mr. Marovitz, you could so move."

Marovitz: "Well I would so move that we dispense with explanation of votes on this particular Roll Call."

Madigan: "Mr. Marovitz, would you withdraw that motion?"

Marovitz: "In view of the board, I would withdraw that motion, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Fine, then the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 ayes, 50 noes, 4 voting present, the motion of Representative Beaupre having received a majority of those voting, the motion is hereby declared carried and House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 392 is tabled. Are there further...are there any Amendments..."

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."



Madigan: "Third Reading. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne, arise?"

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to take up the time of the House, but I asked Mr. Beaupre and Mr. Schraeder at least forty-five minutes ago to hold this on Second Reading so that we may be able to attach an Amendment where we would alleviate the situation at least in regard to the four lane, I emphasize, the four lane divided highway such as Route 55, Route 80, Route 57, and some of the other highways in the State. Now...a...a..I renew that plea, I really don't, I understand that we really...may I have some order."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the person from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, arise?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to preclude the House from considering an Amendment which might allow on interstate highways which they are divided and have the...a...federal safety standard...a..to allow this House to consider on those highways for trucks to..a...a.. travel at fifty-five miles an hour and I'll hold the Bill on Second Reading and we'll see what the will of the Body is."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, arise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that we are getting back to something that was in the 78th General Assembly and the 77th. I originally sponsored the..a.. Amendment that related to the change in the law as it was effected by federal mandate. And I just want to bring to the attention of the Membership present that the federal law that's involved that's also involved federal reimbursements for highway safety does not allow any differential in speed limits. The limits must be uniform throughout the State, otherwise you run into problems..."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook...er, the Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, arise?"

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order. We're not on the order of political speeches are we?"

Madigan: "We're on the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading. Is Mr. Fennessey here? For what purpose does Mr. Barnes arise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I simply take exception to



the Gentleman from Moultrie. That was not a political speech, I was simply asking a question that had been put forth to me. It was not a political speech and I resent the implication that it was."

Madigan: "The order of business is Announcements. Are there any Committee Chairmen who have announcements? The order of business is Announcements. Are there any Committee Chairmen who have announcements? And the Chair recognizes...are there any Committee Chairmen who have announcements. A-ha, wonderful. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Saved by the bell, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Yes."

Washington: "My announcement is that Judiciary Committee I meeting for Thursday has been changed from the House floor to Room 114 through the good graces of the Chairmen of Appropriations I, Representative Lechowicz. It'll be in Room 114 at 8:30 Thursday."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, arise?"

Madison: "A point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Does the request by a sponsor that a Bill be held on Second Reading constitute holding or must the Chair so declare?"

Madigan: "A...the Bill that I believe you are referring to, Mr. Madison, which was Senate Bill 392, is on the order of Third Reading."

Madison: "If I understood correctly, Mr. Speaker, that the sponsor of the Bill indicated that he would be willing to hold it on Second Reading. Now where is it?"

Madigan: "I just told you it's on Third Reading."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that if the sponsor wants it on Second Reading then he is...he should be accorded that..that...that...that position."

Madigan: "It could be, I'm not commenting on that. Your question to me was where is the Bill at, its on Third Reading."

Madison: "My question also was should it not be on Second Reading at the sponsor's request, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "It's on Third Reading. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, for a motion."



Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to suspend Rule 18 of the House in order to hear the following Bills in Appropriations Committee II Wednesday, June 18. Senate Bill 471, Senate Bill 472, 633, 634, 507, and 517."

Madigan: "The motion of Mr. Barnes is to suspend Rule 18 to provide for the hearing of certain Bills in Appropriations Committee II tomorrow at 8:00 A.M., correct?"

Barnes: "8:30."

Madigan: "8:30? Mr. Barnes? Is it 8:30?"

Barnes: "8:30."

Madigan: "I'm going to amend your motion on the face, there's a typographical error for P.M. Its 8:00 A.M. So therefore the question is shall Rule 18 be suspended. All those in favor signify by voting aye. All those opposed by voting no. Clerk, we'd like to take a Roll Call. Mr. Clerk? Is there leave. Objection's been filed. Mr. Clerk will we take a Roll Call? The question is shall Rule 18 be suspended to allow for the hearing of certain Bill in the Committee on Appropriations II tomorrow morning at 8:30 A.M. Have all voted who wished? And for what purpose does the Gentleman from Moutrie Mr. Stone, arise."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, you could have saved yourself quite a bit of running around. All I want to know is what Bills are on the list, sir?"

Madigan: "Mr. Stone, they are Senate Bills 471, 472, 633, 634, 507, 517. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. And on this question there are 118 ayes, no nays, 2 voting present and Rule 18 has been suspended to provide for the hearing of those Bills tomorrow morning. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the purpose of an announcement, I would like to announce that Appropriations II for which we just suspended the rules will meet on the floor of the House at 8:30 A.M. tomorrow morning. 8:30 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, for purposes of announcement, the Date Information



Systems Commission has now received the New York Report and along with its own report, the finalization of this will be done. It will be published and sent to the Members."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the purpose of an announcement, Appropriations I will reconvene tomorrow morning at 8 o'clock in Room 114 for the purpose of hearing the Department of Transportation's budget Bills, House Bill 1947 and 1948 and two Senate Bills. I would ask that the Committee Membership be prompt in attendance at 8 o'clock. Thank you very much."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, unless somebody wants to raise the taxes of the State of Illinois the Revenue Committee has completed its work for this session."

Madigan: "Are there further announcements? Are there further announcements? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now...that the House now stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow."

Madigan: "All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed? The House is adjourned."



INDEX

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 17, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30	Speaker Redmond	House Come To Order
	Reverend Krueger	Prayer
	Speaker Redmond	Roll Call
12:32	O'Brien	Committee Reports
	Speaker Redmond	Consent Calendar - Senate Bills
12:34	O'Brien	
12:35	Speaker Redmond	Constitutional Amendment Second Reading
	O'Brien	House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #34
	Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
12:37	Grotberg	House Bill 600, Senate Amendment Move Not to Concur
	Speaker Redmond	House Non-Concurs
12:39	Daniels	Move we consider SA's #1,2,3,4 to House Bill 729
12:40	Schneider	
12:42	Skinner)	
	Daniels)	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:43	Kane	Urge a 'no' vote
	Speaker Redmond	
12:44	Daniels	To Close
12:47	Speaker Redmond	HB 729, SA's #1,2,3,4; House Concurs
	Greisheimer	House Bill 730 - pull out of record



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:48	Speaker Redmond	Out of the Record
12:48	Dyer	House Bill 787 - SA #1
12:49	Speaker Redmond	House Concurr
12:50	Hirschfeld	House Bill 372 - SA #1
12:50	Speaker Redmond	House Concurr
12:51	Stubblefield	House Bill 650 - SA #1
12:52	Speaker Redmond	House Non-concurr
	Greisheimer	House Bill 658 - SA #1
12:54	Speaker Redmond	House Concurr
	Tipsword	House Bill 674 - SA #1
12:55	Speaker Redmond	
	Kane)	Question
12:55	Tipsword)	Discussion
	Speaker Redmond	
12:57	Houlihan, D.	
	Tipsword	
	Speaker Redmond	
12:57	Shea	Yield
	Tipsword)	Discussion
	Speaker Redmond	Take out of the record
12:59	Walsh)	
	Speaker Redmond)	
12:59	Matijeovich	House Bill 676 - SA #1
	Speaker Redmond	
1:00	Mann)	Question
	Matijeovich)	Discussion



1:02	Speaker	House concurs.
	Yourell	House Bill 727 Senate Amendment #1.
1:05	Speaker Redmond	House concurs.
	Yourell	House Bill 582 Senate Amendment #1.
1:06	Speaker Redmond	House concurs.
	Yourell	House Bill 582 Senate Amendment #1.
1:06	Speaker Redmond	House concurs.
1:07	Greisheimer	House Bill 730 Senate Amendment #1.
	Speaker Redmond	House concurs.
1:10	D'Arco	House Bill 504 Senate Amendment #1.
	Leinenweber)	Question
)	
1:10	D'Arco)	
)	
	Madison)	Question.
)	
1:12	D'Arco)	
1:12	Speaker Redmond	House...
1:13	Greiman	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:13	Palmer	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:16	Washington	
1:18	Speaker Redmond	House concurs House Bill 504 Senate Amendment #1.
	Speaker Redmond	Committee reports.
1:19	Friedrich)	
)	
	Speaker Redmond)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	Jack O'Brien	Committee reports.
	Speaker Redmond	Introduction First Reading
1:20	Jack O'Brien	Introduction First Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3035 Third Reading.
	Calvo	Sponsor
	Speaker Redmond	
1:22	Leinenweber)	Question
	Calvo)	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:23	Lucco	Support
	Speaker Redmond	
1:24	Schlickman)	Question
	Calvo)	
	Speaker Redmond	
1:25	Geo-Karis)	Yield.
	Calvo)	
1:26	Speaker Redmond	House Bill 3035 passed.
	Giorgi	In Chair. House Bill 3036.
	Giorgi	Out of record.
1:27	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3061 Third Reading.
	Giorgi	
	Maragos)	Sponsors.
1:28	Beaupre)	
1:30	Giorgi	
	Waddell)	Yield.
1:30	Beaupre)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

1:31	Giorgi	
1:32	Choate	Withdraw opposition.
	Giorgi	
1:33	Tip sword)	
	Beaupre)	
	Giorgi	
1:35	Beatty)	Yield.
	Beaupre)	
	Giorgi	
1:37	Skinner	
1:41	Giorgi	
1:41	Ewing	
	Giorgi	
1:41	Mautino)	Question.
	Beaupre)	
	Giorgi	
1:42	Stone	Move previous question.
1:43	Giorgi	'Ayes' have it.
	Maragos	To close.
	Speaker Redmond	
1:46	Cunningham	
	Giorgi	
1:47	Freidrich	
	Giorgi	House Bill 3061 passed.
1:48	Skinner	
1:48	Jack O'Brien	
	Giorgi	



	Beaupre	Mistake on calendar.
	Giorgi	Out of record.
	Jack O'Brien	
	Giorgi	
	Barnes	Refer to Geo-Karis.
	Giorgi	Take out.
1:50	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3093.
	Giorgi	
1:50	Choate	Error in calendar.
	Giorgi	
1:50	Hirschfeld	House Bill 3093.
	Giorgi	House Bill.
	Hirschfeld	
	Giorgi	
1:52	Hanahan	
1:53	Giorgi	House Bill 3093 passed.
	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3095 Third Reading.
1:54	Lechowicz	
	Giorgi	House Bill 3095.
	Mann	
1:55	Giorgi	House Bill 3095 passed.
1:54	Lechowicz	House Bill 3096 returned to Second for Amendment.
	Giorgi	
	Beaupre	Out of record.
1:55	Giorgi	Out of record.
1:56	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3098 Third Reading



1:56	Giorgi	House Bill 3098 Third Reading
1:57	Stone	House Bill 3098 Third Reading
	Giorgi	
1:58	Schuneman)	Question
1:59	Stone)	
2:01	Schuneman	Speaks on Bill.
	Giorgi	
2:02	Kosinski)	Question .
	Stone)	
	Giorgi	
2:03	Tipsword	
	Giorgi	
2:05	Griesheimer)	Question.
	Stone)	
	Giorgi	
	Madison	Explains vote.
	Giorgi	
	Stone	
	Giorgi	House Bill 3098 passed.
	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3102 Third Reading.
	Giorgi	House Bill 3102
	Caldwell	
	Giorgi	
	Macdonald)	Yield?
	Caldwell)	
	Giorgi	
	Schneider	



	Giorgi	
	Macdonald)	Further question.
)	
	Caldwell)	
	Giorgi	Take out of record momentarily.
	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3103 Third Reading
	Giorgi	
	Pierce	
	Giorgi	
	Mugalian	Leave to hear House Bill 339.
	Giorgi	Leave granted.
	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 339 Third Reading.
	Giorgi	
	Mugalian	House Bill 3103 & 339.
	Giorgi	
	Lauer	
	Mugalian	
2:25	Giorgi	House Bill 3103 continued.
	Skinner	
2:27	Mugalian)	
)	
	Skinner)	
	Speaker Redmond	
2:28	Yourell)	
)	
	Mugalian)	
2:35	Giorgi	
2:35	Hudson)	
)	
2:36	Mugalian)	
	Giorgi	
2:40	Meyer	Speaks on the Bill.



2:42	Peters	Move previous question.
2:42	Giorgi	'Ayes' have it.
	Mugalian	
2:44	Giorgi	
2:45	Schlickman	Explain vote.
2:46	Giorgi	
2:47	Maragos	Explain vote.
2:48	Giorgi	
	McMaster	Explain vote.
	Giorgi	
	Greiman	
	Giorgi	
2:50	Pierce	
	Giorgi	
2:51	Mann	
	Giorgi	
2:55	Reed	Present vote.
	Giorgi	
2:56	Satterthwaite.	
	Giorgi	
2:57	Borchers	
	Giorgi	
2:59	Skinner	Explain vote.
3:00	Giorgi	
	Rayson	Explain vote.
3:02	Giorgi	House Bill 3103.
3:02	Hudson	Verification of roll.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	Mugalian	Poll absentees.
3:03	Jack O'Brien	Poll absentees.
3:04	Madison	Vote 'aye.'
3:07	Jack O'Brien	Affirmative roll call.
	Giorgi	
3:08	Skinner	Vote me 'aye'.
	Jack O'Brien	Continues affirmative.
3:12	Hirschfeld	Vote me 'aye'.
	Giorgi	
	Bradley	Announcement Von Boeckman's parents in audience.
	Giorgi	
	McClain	Change to 'aye'.
3:13	Giorgi	
	Hudson	"What's the vote"
	Giorgi	"93 Ayes"
3:15	McCort	Change to aye.
	Giorgi	
	Boyle	Aye
	Giorgi	
	Leverenz	Aye.
	Giorgi	
	Jack O'Brien	
	Farley	Aye.
	Mautino	Vote me aye.
3:16	Giorgi	98 aye votes.
	Giorgi	
	Kornowicz	Aye.



	Giorgi	
	Londrigan	Change to aye.
	Giorgi	
3:17	Brandt	Aye.
	Giorgi)	
3:17	Hudson)	Withdraw verification.
3:18	Giorgi	House Bill 339 & 3103 passed.
	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3104 Third Reading
	Giorgi	
3:20	Holewinski	
	Giorgi	
3:20	Lundy	
	Giorgi	House Bill 3104 passed.
	Jack O'Brien	House Bill 3105 Third Reading.
	Giorgi	
3:22	Catania	
	Giorgi	
	Kosinski)	Question.
)	
	Catania)	
	Giorgi	
	Deuster	
	Giorgi	
	Catania	Point of order.
	Giorgi	
	Deuster	
	Giorgi	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	Bradley)	Yield?
)	
	Catania)	
	Giorgi	
	Campbell	Support.
	Giorgi	
	Totten	Oppose.
	Giorgi	
	Schlickman	
	Giorgi	
3:31	Catania	
	Giorgi	House Bill 3105.
3:33	Katz	
3:34	Giorgi	House Bill 3105 passed.
3:35	Matijeovich	In Chair.
	Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 91 Third Reading.
	Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 223 Third Reading.
	Matijeovich	
3:35	Hoffman, G.	
3:37	Matijeovich	Senate Bill 223 passed.
3:37	Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 234 Third Reading.
	Matijeovich	
	Hill	Leave to hear 235 with it.
	Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 235.
	Hill	Senate Bill 234 & 235.
	Matijeovich	
3:39	Schlickman	Point of order.
	Matijeovich	



3:40	Barnes	
	Matijevich	
	Schlickman	
	Matijevich	
3:40	Hill	Sponsor Senate Bill 234.
	Matijevich	
3:40	Tuerk	Oppose
3:46	Matijevich	Bring remarks to a close.
	Tuerk	
	Matijevich	
3:46	Calvo	Support.
	Matijevich	Bring remarks to a close.
3:47	Calvo	
	Matijevich	
3:50	Walsh	Urge no vote.
	Matijevich	
3:53	Simms	Oppose
	Matijevich	
3:56	Hudson	Oppose.
	Matijevich	Bring remarks to a close.
4:00	Hudson	
	Matijevich	
4:00	Ebbesen	Move previous question.
	Matijevich	Ayes.
	Hill	To close.
4:01	Matijevich	Senate Bill 234 & 235.
4:02	Neff	Explain vote.
	Matijevich	



4:07	Borchers Matijeovich	
4:08	Hoffman, R. Matijeovich	Conclude.
4:10	Hoffman, R. Matijeovich Geo-Karis Matijeovich	Oppose. Explain vote. Present. Explain vote.
4:11	Tuerk	
4:12	Matijeovich	Senate Bill 234 & 235 passed.
4:13	Selcke Matijeovich	Senate Bill 248 Third Reading.
4:14	Luft	
4:15	Matijeovich Selcke	Senate Bill 248 passed. Senate Bill 271 Third Reading.
4:16	Matijeovich	
4:16	Williams Matijeovich	
4:20	Schlickman Matijeovich	
4:21	Schneider Matijeovich	
4:23	Bluthardt	Question.
4:24	Williams)) Matijeovich)	
4:25	Shea Matijeovich)	Answers Bluthardt.
4:26) Bluthardt)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	Matijeovich	Stay on question.
4:28	Shea)))) Bluthardt)))) Matijeovich)	
4:30	Deavers	Sponsor yield?
	Williams	
	Matijeovich	
4:33	Maragos	Move previous question.
	Matijeovich	Ayes have it.
4:33	Williams	To close.
	Matijeovich	
4:34	Palmer	Explain vote.
	Matijeovich	
4:35	Walsh	Explain vote.
	Matijeovich	
4:37	Shea	
	Matijeovich	Senate Bill 271 passed.
4:39	Selcke	Senate Bill 283 Third Reading.
	Matijeovich	
4:40	Beatty	
4:41	Matijeovich	Senate Bill 283 passed.
	Selcke	Senate Bill 285 Third Reading.
	Matijeovich	
4:42	Hanahan	
	Matijeovich	
4:43	Schlickman	Urge no vote.
4:45	Matijeovich	
	Neff	



	Matijevich	
4:46	Daniels	
	Matijevich	
4:50	Anderson)	Yield.
)	
	Hanahan)	
	Matijevich	
	Byers	
	Matijevich	
	Cunningham	
	Matijevich	
	Maragos	Move previous question.
	Matijevich	Ayes have it.
	Hanahan)	To close.
	Matijevich	Come to a close.
	Hanahan	
	Matijevich	
	Skinner	
	Matijevich	
	Totten	Leave to return to House Bill 301.
	Matijevich	Leave.
	Grotberg	
	Matijevich	
	Lauer	
	Matijevich	
	Tuerk	
	Matijevich)	
)	
	Geo-Karis)	Explain no vote.
	Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sims	No.
Matijevid	
)	
Palmer)	No.
Matijevid	
Hirschfeld	Vote me no.
Matijevid	
Campbell	Explain no vote.
Matijevid	Senate Bill 285 passed.
Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 286 Third Reading.
Matijevid	
Houlihan, D.	
Matijevid	Senate Bill 286 passed.
Selcke	Senate Bill 321 Third Reading.
Matijevid	
McPartlin	
Matijevid	Senate Bill 321 passed.
Selcke	Senate Bill 336 Third Reading.
Matijevid	
Maragos	
Matijevid	
Hart)	Question
)	
Maragos)	
Matijevid	
Leinenweber)	Question.
)	
Maragos)	
Matijevid	
Skinner	
Matijevid	Senate Bill 336



Maragos	Explain vote.
Matijevich	
Calvo	
Matijevich	
Maragos	
Matijevich	
Hart)	
Matijevich)	
Hirschfeld	Change to no.
Matijevich	Senate Bill 336.
Maragos	Poll the absentees.
Selcke)	
Matijevich)	
Selcke	
Matijevich	
Hart	Ask for verification.
Matijevich	
Skinner	
Matijevich	
Selcke	Calls affirmative votes.
Matijevich	
Van Duyne	Change to aye.
Matijevich	
Williams	Vote me aye.
Matijevich	
Hart	Questions affirmative roll call.
Matijevich	



Von Boeckman	Verified.
Matijeovich	
Hart	
Matijeovich)	
)	
Hart)	Continues
Matijeovich	
Downs	Change to aye.
Matijeovich	
Griesheimer	Change to aye.
Matijeovich)	
)	
Geo-Karis)	Vote me aye.
Matijeovich	
Stubblefield	Record me no.
Matijeovich	
Selcke	96 ayes 46 nays.
Matijeovich	Senate Bill 336 passed.
Selcke	Senate Bill 340 Third Reading.
Matijeovich	
Young	Sponsor
Matijeovich	
Deuster)	Yield?
)	
Younge)	
Matijeovich	Senate Bill 340 passed.
Selcke	Senate Bill 345 Third Reading.
Matijeovich	
Taylor	Take out of record.
Matijeovich	
Selcke	Senate Bill 301 Third Reading.



Matijevich	Senate Bill 301.
Totten	Senate Bill 301..
Matijevich	Senate Bill 301 passed.
Selcke	Senate Bill 356 Third Reading.
Matijevich	
Berman	Ask for recess.
Matijevich	Take this Bill out.
Doorkeeper Paintor	
Bradley	House will be in order.
Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 458 First Reading.
Bradley	
Simms	
Bradley	
Jack O'Brien	House Resolutions.
Bradley	
DiPrima	House Resolution 364 & 365.
Bradley	Resolution adopted.
Jack O'Brien	Further resolutions.
Bradley	House stand at ease.
Jack O'Brien	Committee reports.
Bradley	
Jack O'Brien	
Bradley	Message from the Senate.
Jack O'Brien	
Bradley	Committee reports.
Jack O'Brien	Committee reports.
Bradley	Senate Bill 968 leave to return to Second Reading. Leave granted.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1.
Downs	
Bradley	
Kempiners	Yield?
Downs	
Bradley	Amendment adopted Third Reading Consideration postponed.
Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill First Reading.
Bradley	
Palmer)	
)	Parliamentary inquiry.
Bradley)	
Shea	
Bradley	
Bradley	Senate Bill 356 Third Reading.
Shea	
Bradley	
Schlickman	
Bradley	
Shea	
Bradley	
Meyer)	Question.
)	
Shea)	
Bradley	
Shea	
Bradley	
Duff)	Question.
)	
Shea)	
Bradley	



Duff	Address myself to the Chair.
Jack O'Brien	Madigan in Chair.
Madigan	
Palmer)	Question.
)	
Shea)	
Madigan	
Meyer)	Question.
)	
Shea)	
Madigan	
Borchers)	
)	
Shea)	
Madigan	
Deuster	Move the previous question.
Madigan	Ayes have it.
Madigan	Senate Bill 356 passed.
Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 362
Jack O'Brien	Senate Bill 364 Third Reading.
Madigan	
Bradley	
Madigan	
Walsh	
Madigan	
Berman)	Yield.
)	
Bradley)	
Madigan	
Simms)	Question of the Chair.
)	
Madigan)	Take out of record.



Bradley	
Madigan	
Selcke	Senate Bill 382 Third Reading.
Griesheimer	
Madigan	
Pierce)	Yield.
)	
Greisheimer)	
Madigan	
Skinner	Move previous question.
Madigan	
Schlickman	Oppose.
Madigan	
Griesheimer	To close.
Madigan	Senate Bill 382 passed.
Bradley	Senate Bill 364.
Madigan	
Friedrich	
Madigan	
Tipsword	
Madigan	
Leinenweber)	Question.
)	
Bradley)	
Madigan	
Deuster)	Yield?
)	
Bradley)	
Madigan	
Taylor)	Yield.
)	
Bradley)	



Madigan	Senate Bill 364 passed.
Selcke	Senate Bill 383 Third Reading.
Washington	
Madigan	
Ebbesen)	Yield?
)	
Washington)	
Madigan	
Greisheimer)	Yield?
)	
Washington)	
Madigan	Senate Bill 383 passed.
Selcke	Senate Bill 392 Third Reading.
Madigan	
Beaupre	Leave to bring back to Second.
Madigan	
Beaupre	
Madigan	
Skinner)	
)	
Beaupre)	
Madigan	Senate Bill 393 placed on Second.
Beaupre)	Move to Table Amendment #1.
)	
Madigan)	Have to move to reconsider.
Schraeder	Make motion to reconsider.
Madigan	
Madison	
Madigan	
Van Duyne	
Madigan)	
)	
Beaupre)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Madigan

Third Tape

Friedrich)

Question.

Beaupre)

Madigan

Giglio

Parliamentary inquiry.

Madigan

Giglio

Speak in opposition.

Madigan)

Hudson)

Parliamentary inquiry.

Madigan

Take out.

Hill

"Senator Lemke's attire."

Madigan

Take Senate Bill 362 out.
And return to Senate Bill 392.

Madigan

Beaupre's motion.

Dunn, R.

Explain vote.

Madigan

Giglio

Explain vote.

Madigan

Deavers

Madigan

Van Duyne

Madigan

Greisheimer

Explain vote.

Madigan

Craig

Madigan



Geo-Karis)	Point of order.
)	
Madigan)	
Londrigan	
Madigan	
Brinkmeier	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Skinner	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Shea	
Madigan	
Tipsword	Question of chair.
Madigan	
Yourell	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Flinn	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Kosinski	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Capparelli	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Marovitz	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Ebbesen	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Madison	Explain vote.
Madigan	
Schraeder	Explain vote.



Madigan	
Skinner	Poll absentees.
Madigan	Poll absentees.
Shea)	Parliamentary inquiry.
)	
Madigan)	
Lechowicz	
Shea)	
)	
Lechowicz)	
Madigan	
Walsh	
Madigan	
Shea	
Madigan	Pull 54.
Walsh	Ought to have another roll call.
Madigan	Dump roll call.
Matijevich	
Madigan	
Maragos	Ask for ruling.
Madigan	House Amendment #1 Senate Bill 392.
Marovitz	Move to dispense with explanation of votes.
Madigan	
Marovitz	Withdraw.
Madigan	Beaupre's motion carries. House Amendment #1 tabled.
Madigan	Third Reading.
Van Duyne	
Beaupre	I'll hold on Second.



Madigan	
Barnes, E. M.	
Madigan	
Stone	Point of order.
Madigan	
Barnes, E. M.	
Madigan	Any announcements?
Washington	Announcement.
Madigan	
Madison)	Parliamentary inquiry.
)	
Madigan)	
Barnes, E. M.	Senate Bills 471, 472, 633, 634, 507, 517. Move to suspend Rule 18:
Madigan	
Stone	What Bills are on the list?
Madigan	Rule 18 suspended.
Boyle	Announcement.
Madigan.	
Waddell	
Madigan	
Lechowicz	Announcement.
Madigan	
Maragos	
Madigan	
Shea	Move House stand adjourned.
Madigan	House adjourned.

