

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery. All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate is at the door and wish to enter."

Speaker Redmond: "We haven't come to order yet. The Joint Session of the House and Senate will come to order. House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer this morning by the Clerk, Jack O'Brien."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis moves that we stand in recess until after the Joint Special Session. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Stand in recess till after the Joint Special Session. The Joint Special Session of the House and Senate will come to order. Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, the Senate is at the door and wishes to enter."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objections, please admit the Senate. President of the Senate is leading his troops. Three renegades from the House, former Representative Weaver, Representative Bowers, Representative Merlo, Representative Berman, Representative Vadalabene. No wonder the Senate's so good."

President Hynes: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Doorkeeper."

Doorkeeper: "The Governor and his party are at the door and wish permission to enter."

Speaker Redmond: "He's three minutes early."

Doorkeeper: "Want him to wait?"

Speaker Redmond: "The hour of twelve o'clock having been designed in the Joint Resolution #9, having arrived, the Joint Session of the General Assembly will come to order. The Members of the House and the guests from the Senate please be in their seats. Mr. Clerk, is there a quorum of the House present?"

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

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



President Hynes: "Mr. Speaker, a quorum of the Senate is in attendance."

Speaker Redmond: "There being a quorum of the House and a quorum of the Senate in attendance, the Joint Session is convened. We'll be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Rev. Krueger: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this Joint Session to Thy service this day. Amen. Joseph Addison said, 'To be perfectly just is an attribute of divine nature; to be so to the utmost of our abilities is the glory of man.' Let us pray. Almighty Lord, in whose image man is made, grant to Thy servants, the Members of the Illinois General Assembly, a keen perception of Thy divine nature. Enable them to use this gift as they ponder the mighty and complex issues confronting this state so that their judgments may be to the glory of their fellow man. We ask this in the name of Christ, Our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, is recognized in regard to Joint Session Resolution #1. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move to adopt the Resolution, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion regarding the Joint Session Resolution #1. Question's on the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion's adopted. Pursuant to the Resolution, the following are appointed as a Committee to escort the Chief Executive. Senators Kosinski, Vadalabene, Chew, Rupp, Berning. Representatives Taylor, McPike, Satterthwaite, Neff, and Friedrich. Will the Committee of Escort convene at the rostrum and then retire to the rear of the chamber to await the Governor."

Doorkeeper: "Mr. Speaker, the Governor and his party are at the door and wish permission to enter."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Honorable... admit the Honorable Governor. Recognize the President of the Senate for the purpose of an introduction."

President Hynes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Governor, as the first order of business of this Joint Session, we would like to acknowledge



the presence of the First Lady of Illinois, Mrs. Jayne Thompson. Mrs. Thompson."

Speaker Redmond: "His Excellency, the Governor of the State of Illinois."

Governor Thompson: "Speaker Redmond, President Hynes, my fellow Constitutional Officers, Honorable Members of the 80th General Assembly, honored guests and citizens of Illinois, I thank you for this opportunity. Today marks the beginning of what I hope will be a reasoned and constructive dialogue between the Governor and the General Assembly of the State of Illinois. As is traditional, the Governor has the first word. If history is any guide, he had better use it wisely, because he may not have the last word. Unfortunately, in the most recent chapters of that history, the relationship between the Governor and the General Assembly has sometimes been not so much a dialogue as a diatribe. Emotion often replaced logic. And legitimate contention sometimes degenerated into bitterness and contempt. That stopped on January 10, 1977. As far as I'm concerned, the war between the General Assembly and the Governor's Office is over. The people of Illinois expressed themselves rather clearly on this point in the primary and general elections of 1976 and I am in accord with the will of the people. I hope that the manner in which I presided for six weeks over the Senate of Illinois will be the benchmark of my desire for open and fair legislative relationships on both sides of the aisle. That does not mean, of course, that we will always agree. If we did, there would be little reason for being here. But as long as I am Governor, those disagreements will be about programs and policies, not about personalities and partisanship. Each of us can still fight hard for the things we believe in. In fact, we have the obligation to do so. But no one is going to attack the motives or intentions of the other person. We have too many serious problems to confront without also trying to confront each other. And that goes for politics too. Each of us at the State Capitol represents a political party. Each of us worked very hard to achieve success for that party at the polls last November. But I believe the time



for partisanship is before the election--not after. We may not all share the same goals or the same beliefs but we do share the same constituency. The Governor, the Senate and the House of Representatives were each elected by all the people of the State of Illinois. We owe it to them to check our partisan hats at the door whenever we enter this building. To that end, I will go more than half way to meet with any Republican Legislator. And I will go more than half way to meet with any Democratic Legislator. Each of you already has my phone number. Today, I would like to assure you that it is not a party line. On January, 1977, I took the oath as Governor of Illinois to faithfully discharge the duties of my office to the best of my ability. Those duties include the submission of a balanced budget to this Assembly by the second day of March, a report at the beginning of each annual session of the General Assembly on the condition of the state and recommendation of such measures as I deem desirable. In the coming weeks, I shall send special messages to the Assembly. These messages, accompanied by implementing legislation, will spell out my views on the problems which beset our people--crime; the quality and scope of education; the quality and scope of government; the ethics of our public officials; the business and economic climate of this state; job creation; consumer protection; and conservation of our people, our lands, our resources, and our energy. In a very real sense, the budget message for fiscal year 1978 is a reflection of the condition of the state as I have found it since assuming office on January 10. And the condition of the state, is, in at least some measure, a reflection of the budgets of past years. This year, more than ever before, the state of our state is the state of our checkbook. Or at least the two are inseparable. The intertwining of these two realities, therefore, make it appropriate to consider, in one address, present State of Illinois government and how we propose--through substantive reform and fiscal measures--to continue to strengthen the good, expose and eliminate the evil and the wasteful; remove the

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY**

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

unnecessary and the burdensome, and create and nurture the new and the challenging. People have often compared the state to a ship. The stirring lines of Longfellow from The Building of the Ship can be recalled by every school child. 'Thou, too, sail on, O ship of State! Sail on, O Union, strong and great! Humanity with all its fears, With all the hopes of the future years, Is hanging breathless on thy fate!!' Strong and glorious words, but, except in the best of times, more appropriate to classroom recitals than to a description of the institution we call the state. Perhaps 16 months on the campaign trail, two months of transition and nearly two months on the job have made me a touch cynical, but these are not the best of times in Illinois, and another quotation is more appropriate. 'A monarchy', said Fisher Ames over 100 years ago, 'is a merchantman, which sails well, but will sometimes strike on a rock and go to the bottom; whilst a republic is a raft, which would never sink, but then then your feet are always in water.' Our feet are in the water in Illinois; indeed on some parts of the good ship Illinois we're up to our necks and paddling furiously to stay afloat and in place. It is appropriate, therefore, to take a few minutes to discover how we got here, what we have and where we must go. Our state's fiscal health is not good. And if it is improving it will be due, in large part, to the measures undertaken since the beginning of this administration. As an example, the hiring freeze. More importantly, permanent improvement imperatively depends upon the adoption of the central theme of my budget message--spending less than we take in in fiscal 1978; ridding our budget of its deficit base and putting a little money back in the bank. Only these sorts of measures, not sleight of hand fiscal balances--scarcely good for the day of their utterance--will improve our fiscal health. Governor Walker proudly proclaimed that 'during the four years of this administration, there were no new state taxes and no increases in existing state taxes. We held the line.' But three years of reckless deficit spending drew our bank balance down from



a record high of \$453 million in the spring of 1974 to an estimated \$48 million at the end of this fiscal year. This spending produced cash flow problems which caused those, who in good faith, furnished goods and services to the people of this state, to go without payment, and as a consequence, to borrow money, paying interest on their loans. I would call that interest a 'tax,' and, moreover, a tax imposed without due process of law. The same sort of illusions have been consistently perpetuated with regard to the costs of public assistance. We were promised in Governor Walker's last 'State of the State', that 'if current administrative controls are maintained, we can end the fiscal year within the total budget appropriation.' I suspect the 'current administrative controls' are code words for persistent refusal to pay the cost of public aid recipient care by the private sector, but, passing this suspicion, the plain fact is that before the end of this fiscal year we will have a public aid deficit of approximately \$40 million, just as we had public aid deficits in the spring of 1974, 1975, and 1976. If, in some measure, spending for public assistance is unpredictable because it is impossible to know with precision how many people will lose their means of support and require assistance, how many families will be deserted, and how many needy persons will get sick, let us say so. It is time to stop being proud in March at budget time and chagrined the next spring when paying the bills. We are currently in crisis in corrections. The outgoing state of the state message makes it appear that the problem came about because 'in the last year, we have suddenly been confronted with an exploding prison population.' But a comparison of inmate population figures will show a steadily increasing upward trend for more than a year. 'This problem was brought to the attention of the General Assembly,' Governor Walker said, 'in its most recent session, but they refused to appropriate funds for additional facilities.' With all due respect, that is a cop-out. In the closing days of the last session, planning funds were sought and not appropriated. Neither the



magnitude of the problems we face, nor suggested short, medium and long range solutions were advanced until the early days of this administration. Much is claimed for the advancement of transportation systems in Illinois. And we have made progress. But politics--city and state--have impeded solution of the Crosstown impasse and no new initiatives were proposed on either side until February of 1977. Speaking for the people of the State of Illinois, I intend to pursue those initiatives advanced by myself and by the Mayor of the City of Chicago in good faith to end the Crosstown impasse once and for all. Failure to face up to shrinking sources of revenue for the maintenance of our streets, highways and bridges has left us in the position where our first priority must be to save, literally save, our existing roads, not build new ones. But there is little point in going on. First, because the previous administration accomplished some good and this is neither the time, nor the place, to assess its total debits and credits. History will record them. Secondly, because despite our best intentions, my successor will someday write critically of my stewardship of office, although hopefully at shorter length and in more gentle tones. Government is not perfect, nor can it be. Montaigne was right--'It is very easy to accuse a government of imperfection, for all mortal things are full of it.' It is time now to turn aside from criticism of the past and say where we are, and where we are going. First our fiscal problems. To get some sense of the perspective of my predecessor, I have gone back to his last State of the State Message, submitted on January 9, 1977. This report was 'a message of review' of the executive and legislative stewardship of the last four years. I have reviewed that report and I must indicate some areas of disagreement. On January 9, 1977, Governor Walker said: 'The state's fiscal health is good. . . at the end of December, the state's general revenue funds had a balance of \$168.8 million, up by \$43 million from June 30. In other words, the state's fiscal health is improving.' And yet, on the second working day of the new year the balance



was down to \$120 million, nearly \$49 million less than the \$168.8 million so proudly proclaimed just four days before. And, as we have since discovered, to achieve a seemingly improved calendar year end balance, December expenditures were delayed and January receipts were accelerated. It is time to end fiscal quackery of this sort. It fools no one for long; people and institutions cannot live on bank balances produced in this manner. It is time to end budgets which are constructed, and fiscal statements which are written, to make the Governor 'look good.' It is time that the Governor, by performance, be good. I have already described how our state's general fund--our checkbook--has been almost wiped out--drawn down to about one-tenth of what it was just four years ago. It is no exaggeration to say that Illinois has walked right up to the brink of bankruptcy and looked over the edge. Any unforeseen emergency--even one of a modest size--could push us over the brink. The past administration left us with a number of deficiencies totalling millions of dollars, for which there is no provision in the fiscal 1977 budget. Even barring such calamities, the current situation makes the simple act of paying bills on time a chancey proposition. But there are more serious consequences. The citizens of Illinois are not the only people concerned with our state's fiscal health. From time to time we have to borrow funds for schools, hospitals and roads. The people who lend us those funds are also interested in Illinois. Very interested. How they size up our fiscal condition determines not just the rate at which they will lend us money, but even whether they will lend it at all. Although the state currently maintains an AAA bond rating, when it comes to the actual sale of those bonds, the interest we have been paying during the past year has been higher than the normal AAA interest rates. In fact, it has been close to the normal AA rates. And what a difference a letter makes! Doubts about Illinois' ability to pay off its debts have already cost the taxpayers of Illinois dearly. Further erosion of investor confidence could drive up the cost of schools,



hospitals, and roads by millions of dollars. On top of decimating our general fund and endangering our credit rating, the three previous years of deficit spending have also built a deficit base of \$78 million into the 1978 budget. That means that we can't use all of our new revenues on new spending. The first \$78 million of new money must go just to catch up to and pay for the old level of spending. Given this unfortunate state of affairs, what are the options we have on March 2nd of 1977? On the one hand there's bankruptcy. That option has certain distinct advantages. To name just two, we wouldn't have to restrain spending this year and we wouldn't have to raise taxes either. If that sounds a lot like our recent policies, then you understand exactly why bankruptcy is so near at hand. But bankruptcy also has some serious disadvantages. Like not being able to build schools, hospitals or roads or provide human services. This option is unacceptable to me and I hope to you. If you don't like bankruptcy as an option, then you could choose to raise general taxes. But there's a problem with that option, too. Namely, I campaigned for Governor against it. Many of you campaigned against it. As I stand here today, I have been Governor for almost two months and I still can't guarantee any citizen of Illinois that the taxes he or she is paying are spent wisely. How then, can I, in good conscience, ask for more taxes? If you rule out bankruptcy and you rule out a raise in general taxes, then there is really only one other option! You hold spending within revenues. And by that, I mean within real revenues. On the surface this is not too radical a proposal. There isn't a legislator on this floor who would not subscribe to the proposition that the state should live within its means. But what happens when that proposition means saying 'no' to a worthwhile interest? A worthwhile interest that has the backing of many voters? A worthwhile interest that helps the district that you represent? A worthwhile interest that Illinois cannot afford at current levels of revenue? That's when the real test comes. Separating the necessary from the desirable. Separating the essential from the expected.



I believe I have submitted to you a budget which does exactly that. This budget will: 1. Total 10 billion, 47 million dollars in all funds for fiscal 1978, down \$70 million from fiscal 1977. 2. This budget will spend 311 million new dollars against the anticipated revenues of \$426 million in the general funds. 3. This budget will wipe out the current deficit base of \$78 million left over from fiscal 1977 in the general funds. 4. This budget will add \$37 million surplus to the general revenue fund, the first surplus in four years. 5. This budget will give the largest share of the dollar increase, \$125 million, to education, with \$50 million of that going for higher education and \$75 million to elementary and secondary education. 6. This budget will deal with a crisis situation in our prisons by allocationg \$20 million in general revenues and \$25 million from the capital budget to corrections. 7. This budget will cut back or eliminate low priority programs and allow modest growth in most areas of government. This is a realistic budget that will satisfy realistic goals. It contains no artifice, no tricks or gimmicks which suggest that things will be achieved which cannot be achieved. This budget will require no general tax increase. It will restore investor confidence and lower the interest costs the state must pay to bond holders. As you examine this budget in the days ahead--and I know you will examine it in detail--bear in mind that it is a budget for all the people of Illinois. Because, in the end, the cost of it will be borne by all the people of Illinois. This budget contains recommended levels of appropriations. It does not mean that all of this money should be spent. It is our obligation, and I mean to enforce it, to continue to examine this budget through the rest of fiscal 1977 and into fiscal 1978, to make sure the money is wisely spent. If it is not, it won't be. Although our fiscal crisis has been and will continue to be the most immediate threat to the quality of life in Illinois, there are many problems of a non-fiscal nature which must also be addressed in the months ahead. If we are to avoid bankruptcy or higher general



taxes, we must generate new revenue from present sources. I know of no better way to do this than to so conduct government in Illinois to encourage investor confidence in this state, to persuade our fellow citizens to invest the capital necessary to create jobs--permanent jobs--in the private sector. We will pursue this goal with every ounce of energy that we possess, but the cooperation of this Assembly is vital. But what of those who have no jobs? Traditionally, it has been assumed that the first obligation of a state government to its needy citizens is compassion. And that the first obligation of a state to its taxpaying citizens is efficiency. But compassion for the needy does little good if it takes the form of bureaucratic delays, confused and overlapping programs and potential rip-offs of the needy and the state alike. Similarly, the pursuit of efficient state government will do nothing for the taxpayer if it simply means the efficient distribution of an even larger tax burden. Thus, a government that limits itself to compassion for the needy and efficiency for the taxpayer short-changes both. In 1977, the government's job must be to provide more efficiency for the needy and more compassion for the taxpayer. Most of us believe that too much of Illinois government is overlapping, duplicative and in organizational disarray. Boards, commissions, committees, and agencies abound. Inter-departmental rivalries and frictions are real. Empires are constructed in stealth and bureaucratic turfs are guarded with all the zeal of a street gang on the block. Indeed, the commonly agreed upon problems of failure to reorganize Illinois government since 1917, led my opponent and me to jointly appoint the Bonniwell Commission, whose report is now public. The options set forth by that report should be fully debated and challenged. But after 60 years of delay, there is no need to put it off any longer. On the social services front, I believe that in this fiscal year, mission reform is more important than structural change. It will do us little good--in fact it will do us harm--to wrap inefficiency, waste and failure in a shiny new package. It will do us little good



to replace four agencies which currently fail to deliver adequate services to the people with one brand new agency that fails to deliver adequate services to the people. Putting red tape on a computer only produces computerized red tape. And change for the sake of change may be good public relations, but it's bad management. As I interviewed candidates for social service cabinet positions, I encountered almost universal skepticism concerning the umbrella concept of social service delivery. I do not reject it, but I am not yet ready to accept it. Mission reform and inter-agency cooperation--especially that designed to capture available, but untapped, federal reimbursement dollars--is the place to begin. And I intend to begin by creating an intra-cabinet group, the Governor's Council on Social Services, which will insure that the directors of the Departments of Public Aid, Mental Health, Public Health, and Children and Family Services, and their finance directors, cooperate. We will not repeat the examples of the last administration where the directors sometimes not only failed to cooperate for the benefit of the people, but oftentimes wouldn't even talk to each other. There are, however, compellingly logical candidates for reorganization. The Department of Law Enforcement is one. I believe the Department should have a Division of Patrol; a Division of Investigations; a Special Investigations Division; and a Division of Support Services or Operations. I believe that the investigative talents of the State Police and the Illinois Bureau of Investigation should be combined. First, to end the rivalry, jealousy and duplication which existed in the past and which exist today. Second, to make more efficient the task of supporting the road trooper. Third, to employ detective skills in areas now lacking--narcotics enforcement in suburban and rural communities; increased assistance to local law enforcement in these same places; crackdown on abuses of the public aid program and other rip-offs of government and detection of corruption and conflict of interest in agencies responsible to the Governor. I also believe that the Department of Finance should be merged with



the Department of General Services to form the Department of Administrative Services. I believe we could save time, money and energy--and increase support for substantive mission agencies--with such a step. Because the General Assembly was not organized in this session until near the end of February, it is probably impractical to obtain these modest reorganization proposals through the exercise of the executive reorganization powers of Article V, Section 11 of the Constitution. If this proves to be the case, I will submit appropriate legislation to this Assembly at a later date in this session. This will allow sufficient time for both public and legislative debate. In addition to fiscal restraint and general reorganization, there are a number of other themes which I would like to present very briefly at this time. As in the case of reorganization, I have not made a final decision regarding the best course of action in each matter. But I wish to place them on the table to stimulate a general discussion that can produce solutions acceptable to all the people of Illinois. Uppermost in my mind is the need to protect our citizens from over institutionalization. There is an ever-present danger. Sometimes in our eagerness to help, the state does much more harm than good. We sometimes think that if we take an elderly person who can no longer manage alone and put him in a state hospital or in a nursing home, feed him, clothe him, pump him full of tranquilizers and park him in front of the television... we've done some sort of favor. But that just isn't so. Time and time again, we've found that whether we're talking about the elderly, or the retarded, or the physically disabled, the most disruptive and dehumanizing thing we can do is to remove them from their home environment. That should be done only as a last resort. The Thompson administration is going to put the emphasis on home assistance programs which will permit those people who can remain at home to do so. Throughout Illinois--in every area of interest and at every level of government--policies are in place which had their origins in the legislative and bureaucratic halls of Springfield. These are commonly



referred to as 'state mandated programs.' They range across the board--education, corrections, health, conservation--almost every area of government. During the course of the last campaign, individual citizens who serve local units of government--members of school boards, county boards, city councils and their associates--complained consistently about two points: (1) Local people had little to say about the wisdom or necessity of programs imposed on a statewide basis; (2) Perhaps more importantly, once mandated, state programs are inadequately funded by the state. These conditions result in a widespread feeling among the people of Illinois that they are being told to do things that are not necessarily good for their local communities by a state government that rushes in to impose judgments, but disappears around the corner when the time comes to pay the bills. This is not the time or the place to debate the wisdom of individual programs. It is no doubt desirable to impose minimum standards of health, safety, and education in every area of the state. But the lines between necessary policies, desirable policies, and interesting policies are hard to draw, and perhaps those in Springfield have not always taken the time to distinguish between these concepts. Whatever the problems are, however, there is plainly no excuse for telling local communities whose financial resources are in reality, finite, that they must carry out state mandated programs without sufficient financial help. It will be the policy of this Administration--one in which I hope this Assembly will concur--to re-examine state mandates. I intend to appoint a Commission on State Mandated Programs, to be chaired by the Lieutenant Governor, and to include members from the legislature and the private sector. I will ask this Commission to immediately assess the nature and scope of state mandated programs--in education and elsewhere--and the financial support now contributed by the state. I am going to ask this Commission to report back to me and to you in time for solutions to be found--at least in some areas--during this legislative session. It is particularly important to do so, I believe, in this year



of fiscal restraint. Throughout the campaign, I repeatedly said that education was my number one priority. I think this budget supports that claim. But just because an area is a number one priority does not mean that every single program in that field is necessarily a good one. An education program can be every bit as outdated, inefficient and duplicative as a state program in any other field. To many people, education is a sacred cow. It is to me. But even a sacred cow can stand a new diet, every once in awhile. I challenge everyone involved in the field of education to begin a reassessment of programs at every level. The State of Illinois will be doing the same. A word about federal funds is appropriate. I am not one of those people who will go running to Washington with every problem. I know that every time I turn to Washington, I am really turning to the taxpayers, to the people of Illinois who are federal taxpayers, too. Washington is no cavalry that is waiting just over the hill to rescue us from our past indiscretions. They may have a few horses there, or at least parts of them, but they are not about to come charging out to Springfield with sacks of money just because we need it. There is no reason in conscience or in equity, to expect that Congressmen and Senators from 49 other states will vote to give Illinois more than its fair share. There is no reason to believe that President Carter will do so. An examination of his budget for fiscal 1978 confirms this. On the other hand, there is no question that the states of the Great Lakes region have been short-changed on their fair share of the federal dollar. To that end, I will upgrade the size and the professionalism of our state's Washington office, to support our case whenever it needs supporting, and to make certain that the state reorganization makes us better able to secure those funds which are available. Finally, what about new programs not contained in this budget? As Governor, I say that you can have all of them that you want. But the catch is you have to pay for every one with new and additional revenues. For example, we are not now providing our people with the

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



recreational facilities that the fifth most populous state in the Union ought to have. But to buy more recreational land and water costs money--money which is in short supply this year. If we are to expand recreational opportunities for people who like to boat; then we ought to raise boat registration fees. We cannot build and dredge lakes for nothing. If we are to have more lands for hunting and snowmobiling, to mention just two recreational pursuits, then we ought to raise the fees involved here. The price of a hunting license has not changed in Illinois for 20 years. If we are to have more fish in our lakes and rivers, perhaps we ought to build the \$15 million fish hatchery we have been talking about. But the price of a fishing license in Illinois has not changed in 20 years.

In short, we cannot expect to provide recreation facilities with 1977 costs at 1957 revenues. No private business or private home operates in such a fashion. How can we expect government to do so? Or take an even more critical area. Roads. Many of our streets, roads, highways, and bridges were constructed before or shortly after the turn of the century. They are, in many instances, literally falling apart. But our resources limit new spending in the road program this year to approximately \$500 million. This is all we can afford with current revenues. But it may not satisfy the people of Illinois. Given the severity of this year's winter, combined with the perceived needs of local regions long ignored, a larger road-building program is probably desirable. But there are few federal dollars to be had and the road fund will be dangerously low at the end of next year. If we want more new roads, if we want to repair and modernize existing roads, if we want to repair and replace bridges--throughout Illinois--then we will have to tax ourselves more to do it. Nobody builds roads for free. The gasoline sales tax and license plates fees in Illinois are probably inadequate to support the kind of road program which the people of Illinois may want, and which this Assembly may well approve. I commend such a possibility to your consideration. In short, we must stop deceiving ourselves



and our fellow citizens. Everything that government does for the people costs money--their money. We understand this perfectly well in our private lives. It is high time we understand it in our public lives, too. What the future of Illinois requires is not so much conservative government. . .or liberal government. . .or Republican government. . .or Democratic government. . .but honest government. Government in which the real costs of every policy are spelled out in advance. . .and the people are given the necessary facts and figures to make the right decision. Honest government--it's so easy to talk about--and so hard to maintain. Truth is more than just the absence of outright falsehood. It means pointing out the price tag as well as the benefits. . .the disadvantages as well as the advantages. . .the dangers as well as the opportunities in every government action. We can have exactly that kind of plain-speaking government in Illinois. And as long as I am the Governor, I promise that we will. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Committee of Escort come forward to the rostrum to escort the Governor from the chambers? President of the Senate, the Honorable Thomas Hynes, is recognized for a motion."

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

Speaker Redmond: "President has moved that the Joint Session do now arise. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Joint Session will arise. Representative Bradley, will you come to the podium?"

Speaker Bradley: "The House will be in order. Roll Call for attendance. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Mugalian is excused because of illness, that Representative Greiman is excused because of illness, that Representative Houlihan, Daniel, is excused and that Representative Capparelli is excused?"

Speaker Bradley: "It will so show. Is Mr. Ryan on the floor. Are there any absentees on the Republican side? The Gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you have the Journal show that Representative McAvoy and Representative Sevcik are excused by virtue of illness?"

Speaker Bradley: "It will so show. Representative from Cook, Mr. Collins, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, the permanent Speaker asked me to announce that Marquette beat Tulane last night 63 to 44."

Speaker Bradley: "Where did they play? At home or away? Is everybody on the Roll Call for attendance now? Let's everybody get on there other than those that have been excused. Roll Call for attendance. Last call. Clerk will take the record. We've got some business to conduct. If we could clear the aisles and Members will be in their seats, we can move along. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate's concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution, to wit. House Joint Resolution #6, adopted by the Senate March 1, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution, to wit. House Joint Resolution #9, concurred in by the Senate March 1, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the attached Senate Joint Resolution and adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Joint Resolution #12, adopted by the Senate March 1, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the attached Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of



Representatives, to wit. Senate Joint Resolution #15, adopted by the Senate March 1, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Tipsword, Chairman from the Committee on Insurance to which the following Bills were referred; action taken March 1, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendation: do not pass House Bill 90. Representative Schneider, Chairman from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bill was referred; action taken March 1, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendation: do pass House Bill 283."

Speaker Bradley: "Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 509, Schlickman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Library District Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 510, Pierce. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar on the Order of Motions appears House Bill 10 and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Bradley: "Let me try to get you some order, sir. Could we give the Gentleman some order, please?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this motion is related to the death penalty capital punishment. Yesterday in Judiciary II Committee, there were the necessary number of votes, 13, to move this Bill out of Committee. However, because of the transitory nature of the Committee in today's climate where we need a vote of the majority of the Committee present and the movement of such votes within the Committee, only 11 of the 13 votes were mustered. Only five were opposed to the Bill. Last Session, if you remember, we also were in a position to discharge Committee to bring the death penalty to the House floor."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kosinski, just a minute please. Mr. Doorkeeper, would you see that those people who are not entitled to the



floor would be removed from the chamber. And would the Members please be in their seats so that we can at least hear the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, on his very important motion? Let's give him some order. Proceed, sir."

Kosinski: "I repeat, Mr. Speaker, in the last General Assembly, this action was also necessary to bring the death penalty to the floor. After it arrived in this Body, it sailed out of the House with 122 to 45 vote. It then went to the Senate, but the Senate in that late moment of the Session was not prepared to hear this legislation. In consequence, it was not acted on. It was not killed in the Senate. It was not heard. We reached that point in time early in the Session this year. I prefiled House Bill 10 which is the same legislation this House passed last Session. It was heard in Committee fairly but the transitory nature of and movement of Members within that Committee, fell two votes short of moving it to the floor. In consequence, Mr. Chairman, I move now to discharge Judiciary II, bring this matter to the floor for the intention, attention rather of the entire Body. I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I listened with interest to the motion of the Vice-Chairman of Judiciary II Committee to discharge the Committee with regard to his Death Penalty Bill. I would like to say that it is very early in the Session and we're really going to have to decide whether we're going to work in Committees or whether we're just going to discharge everything and do the Committee's work on the floor. The fact of the matter is that there were several Members of the Committee who had a good deal of sympathy with a motion that was made by Mike Getty, joined in by Mr. Schlickman and some other Members that a Committee, a Subcommittee ought to be appointed to report back within a very short date with some improvements that ought to be made with regard to the three Death Penalty Bills that are pending before the Committee. The Bill of Mr. Kosinski's is being reposted. It would seem to me that the Gentleman from Cook would be pleased to have



Legislators of the ability of Representative Getty and Representative Mann and Representative Schlickman and others give their talents to try to have the Committee report out the best Bill possible. I would strongly oppose the motion as being untimely. I have no objection if the Judiciary II Committee does not discharge its duties in a reasonable date, to having it brought out to the floor. The matter was only heard last night. It will be heard again. It has been posted again. The Gentleman is proceeding with unseemly haste in my opinion and I feel very reluctant indeed to see us this early in the Session start discharging Committees, wasting the time of the House on the floor on Bill after Bill when the matter could be better done in Committee and will be done in Committee if this motion is resisted."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the past couple of Sessions I think that the Legislature has really gone backwards. I remember the time when something happened in Committee and you knew that that Committee action was going to be upheld on the floor of this House and I think that was very responsible. And I think that we have retrogressed to the point that Committees really don't mean anything any more. And I wrote a letter to every Chairman and Vice-chairman and... of which, by the way Representative Kosinski is a Vice-chairman of a Committee, and I said, 'Let's go back to that day when the Committee action means something.' Now, Representative Katz has already told us that the Committee is working on a Death Penalty Bill. That's responsible. There is no need for any of us now to run quickly and discharge a Committee. That's the most irresponsible act especially coming at this early date in the legislative business. And I would urge Chairmen of Committees, the Vice-chairmen to stand fast right now, vote against this motion and show that we are going to be responsible. The Death Penalty Bill is not the issue right now. The issue right now is are we going to hold fast and uphold Committee action? That's the issue right now and I urge



the Members to start being responsible and do so by voting against this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "Question of the Sponsor, he indicates he'll yield, sir."

Waddell: "It seems rather strange to me that the Vice-chairman would ask this request of the Chairman of the same Committee. Therefore, would you kindly answer for me, are you fearful that the Chairman of that Committee, therefore, is going to appoint a Subcommittee that may do harm to your Bill and if so, what?"

Kosinski: "Representative Waddell, I have been Subcommitteeed to death on this Bill. Last year, we had Subcommittees in Joliet, in Wheaton, in Springfield, in Chicago, every possible input was put into this Bill by prosecutors and people opposed to the Bill. The Bill has been streamlined. Subcommittee action, in my mind at this point, is dilatory. The Membership of this General Assembly, the 100 Members Cosponsoring this legislation know precisely what's in that Bill. Within Constitutional guidelines, it's an excellent Bill. There will still be action in the Senate Body who wants to have its input. I think I repeat this is dilatory. I think it's imperative that we move on this measure, put it on Second Reading in the House where it still is subject to change if we wish and I don't think any change is necessary, move it out of this House and move it into the Senate for any further action that it requires. The Senate, in a sense, is the Subcommittee in this instance. It's a good, Constitutional Bill and was worked over well in many Subcommittees. I think we're subcommitteeing it to death."

Waddell: "Mr. Sponsor, with that explanation, I concur with your actions."

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

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't want to get personal with the Vice-chairman because he's a good friend. and he's a fine Legislator. But if you'll look at the House Calendar, you will see that the Vice-chairman who is the Sponsor,



filed this motion to discharge the Committee before the hearing yesterday in Judiciary. Now, if that isn't, if that isn't a little anticipatory, I don't know what is. All I'm saying to you, regardless about how you feel, don't let's be stam-peded. Don't let us look like a lynch mob that's thirsty for blood. Sure, there's been Subcommittee hearings. Where life is involved, you would expect there to be Subcommittee hearings. Let's not just rush this thing over to the Senate because we can't afford to wait another week or two to fry somebody. It deals with life and death and I think we ought to take a long look in depth. You'll still have a chance to vote for a Bill that comes out of Judiciary and anybody knows that Committee, it's Chairman and Vice-chairman will know... it will receive fair and detailed treatment. So, let's not go for this at this time."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As one person who supported the death penalty program during the end of the last Session, I would like to rise in opposition to the motion to discharge Committee. Seems to me that if we are to be a deliberative Body, the responsibility must rest with the Committee. At this juncture, barely into the first week in March, to start motions to discharge Committees seems to me to be at best premature. It's the responsibility of those of us who sponsor legislation to see that at the very least, the Members who are supportive of our position in Committee are present. Particularly on significant legislation like this. If we were in the darker days in terms of nearing, being near the end of the Legislative Session, then motions to discharge Committee might be given more serious consideration. But in my judgment, I believe that this motion should be resisted at this time. Not because the idea is something which I can't subscribe to because I do subscribe to it, but because the motion that's presented at this time is premature in my judgment."

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



Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know why we want to rush this Bill on the floor without full Committee hearing on it. Now say what you will or may, the question on capital punishment insofar as I'm concerned, insofar as all minorities are concerned, is whether or not it will be evenly applied to all citizens alike. I think we need more time to look into it and I believe all of you would agree with that. Whether or not it will be more evenly applied and God knows I believe that that has not been the case in the past."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Davis: "In the past and even now..."

Kosinski: "He's speaking to the merits of the Bill."

Davis: "...especially the southern states..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Davis, just a minute. Mr. Kosinski, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Kosinski: "With due respect to our senior Member, I think he is speaking to the merits of the Bill rather than the motion on the House floor."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point's well taken. Mr. Davis, would you... to the motion."

Davis: "Well, he wants me to speak to the motion. Well, the motion is to rush it. The motion is to hurry. The motion is to bring it out here and without full Committee consideration and you're talking about a man's life. This is what you're talking about-- the life of a human being. And I say to you that time is of the essence and this Bill should be fully studied because all of human beings are involved, but especially minorities. This should be given every Committee consideration without discharging the Committee this early in the Session."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise in opposition to this motion cause I'd like to point out to the Sponsor of this motion that this is not the 79th General Assembly. This is the 80th General Assembly. There are over 40 new Members in this House and they're entitled to have a full hearing on every Bill, not only the Death Penalty Bill, but every Bill. And to take this



out of Committee without that full hearing, I think does a disservice to those of us who are new. And also does a disservice this early in the Session to orderly procedure. And while I'm not saying I'm speaking for the other Members, the other new freshman Members, I think this is something very serious to consider and don't just haphazardly, with your guns flying in the air, run through and discharge the Committee this early. And I urge you very strongly to vote against this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "For the information of the Members who are standing, we have about six or seven and I'll get to each one of you as quickly as I can. The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with Representative Kosinski that this Bill, this concept whether it be this specific Bill that the concept has been Subcommittee'd to death. I think that all of us probably know at this point whether we're going to vote 'ayé' or 'nay' on this Bill if it ever comes to the floor. We have all seen obstructionist tactics by the opponents of the concept and this is what is going on in Judiciary II Committee right now. I think that each of us has the obligation to be prepared to vote on this Bill because it has been kicking around whether you've been a Member of the House or whether you have not been a Member of the House. The concept of the death penalty has been kicking around in this state long enough that everybody is pretty well convinced as to how he's going to vote. It seems to me unconscionable that we should dilly-dally, that we should delay, especially since we know that if the Bill does pass the full House of Representatives, it will go over to the House of Lords where it will again be Subcommittee'd to death and will be subject to the dilly-dallying of the noble Lords. I think we owe it to the Sponsor of the Bill, the one who has the guts to fight the concept through to bring this Bill to the floor of the House, vote it up or down and then let the Senate do its will. I strongly support the motion of Mr. Kosinski to discharge Judiciary II."



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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with a minute of your indulgence, I would like to take this opportunity to trace some of the history of House Bill 10. As it's been recited previously this Bill was introduced in the 79th General Assembly. And as the previous speaker pointed out, it's true that this is in fact the 80th General Assembly and a new Body. However, I would like to point out to that Member that at that time, this Bill received full hearing and four separate Subcommittee hearings throughout the State of Illinois. Now addressing specifically the question of has this Bill been heard in the Judiciary II Committee in the 80th General Assembly. I would like to point out to the previous speaker and the new Members of the House of Representatives that starting three weeks ago, first we heard the proponents of the capital punishment legislation testify. Last week, we heard the opponents testify. And yesterday, we had a hearing on the merits of the three various Bills that were introduced before the Body. So, Gentleman and Ladies, we've had three separate full hearings by the Judiciary II Committee at which time any Member of this House or interested party of the State of Illinois could have appeared and listened to the testimony. Now, I want to point out to you that yesterday this Bill, when a motion was made to send to Subcommittee, it failed. Yesterday when a motion was made to pass this Bill out, it also failed. But if my recollection serves me properly, it failed by a vote of 11 to 5 to 2 voting 'present'. Several of the Members who have previously stated that they were proponents of capital punishment were not present unfortunately due to a conflict in their schedule at the time. So what do we have now that we're faced with? We're faced with a motion to bring this matter on the House floor to Second Reading in order to save time, in order to expedite, yes, expedite a full floor action hearing on capital punishment. I want to emphasize, too, that a similar piece of legislation has been heard in the Senate and that it's presently being considered in Senate at the present



time. Are we rushing? Yes, maybe we are rushing. Why are we rushing? I'll tell you why we're rushing. Look at the headlines today. Review them in the Chicago Tribune. They are a courtroom death threat to assault victims. How many times do you pick up a newspaper and you hear about threats on people's lives. How many times do you see people being murdered in this country? You tell me what's a deterrent to somebody when they're arrested and they're faced with life imprisonment. You tell me what a police officer does when he goes into a life threatening situation and there's no deterrent, there is not a law in the State of Illinois that..."

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

Sandquist: "A point of order."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, sir."

Sandquist: "My point of order--he's not addressing the motion..."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman please talk to the motion and not to the issue, sir?"

Daniels: "I'm talking to the motion, I'm talking to the questions that were brought up about why we have to move right now on this piece of legislation. We're talking about lives. Yes, we are. We're talking about saving the lives of innocent victims. I, for one, believe that it is a deterrent to crime. I, for one, sponsor this legislation and proud to stand on this House floor and say to you that in Illinois, we need capital punishment on the books as a deterrent to the most heinous crime our society must face. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, now's your time to stand up and be counted for law and order. Now's your opportunity to vote for passage of this motion."

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

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, arise?"

Davis: "It's too late. I was going to object to the speech the last Gentleman made. You told me to speak to discharging the Committee. Now if we're going to... I'm telling you about this



thing being evenly applied. If we're going to evenly apply it, then evenly apply the rules to all of us."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McAuliffe, would you please confine your remarks to the motion."

McAuliffe: "I didn't say anything. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I haven't said a word yet. I was going to compliment Representative Daniels. He's a tough act to follow. But let me speak in support of Representative Kosinski. Representative Kosinski is from my district. He is a friend of the policemen in the district as I hope I am. We have 2,800 policemen in the district and I travel around the City of Chicago talking to these various policemen. They can't understand how we can dilly-dally down here all these years and fool around and can't pass a Death Penalty Bill. Every time I go in a police station, somebody says, 'When are you guys going to get off your duff down there and do something.' They don't understand all those parliamentary maneuvers. Representative Kosinski..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. McAuliffe. I think that Mr. Madison, for a point of order and he wants to make the point that you're not addressing yourself to the motion. And would you please confine your remarks to the motion, sir?"

McAuliffe: "I'll confine myself to the motion. Representative Kosinski, if he filed a motion in advance of the hearing, did so because he realizes he was facing a stacked deck. You can't get any kind of law and order legislation of that Committee and I strongly support Representative Kosinski's motion to discharge the Committee. Let's get the Bill on the House floor and let's pass the Bill and let's make it known to the people in Chicago that murder is a cruel and unusual punishment. And let's put a stop to it, let's pass this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Kosinski, to close."



Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to clear the record, I support the Committee system. This is my fourth term. I support the Committee system but there comes a time in important legislation when action of the entire Body is necessary. As was pointed out, we've had three hearings on this Bill. There was the necessary votes in Committee to pass it on Second Reading today and only because we have such conflict in Committees, two votes were lost from that Committee because they were called elsewhere and the Bill didn't get out only by two votes. There were only five against. There were eleven for after the Committee hearings. Two more votes and this wouldn't be necessary. Now what are we supposed to do? Go through that facade again? I support the Committee system. I'm a Vice-chairman of a Committee, but this is the time for action on a piece of legislation that's vital to the people of Illinois--a piece of legislation that as a deterrent can save lives. There are murders every day. Let's get going. Let's move. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer, arise?"

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, just to point out for those that there are forty or so that didn't serve with us last Session there were nine Committee votes in the Judiciary II Committee. They were defeated on the floor of the House either by, in this case over 100 votes to discharge a Committee and this is the first time that again, there were over 111 votes in the air."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I understand there's another motion on the Clerk's desk to discharge that Committee that deals with the same subject. I think if we're going to discharge the Committee for one Death Penalty Bill, then we ought to do it for every Bill for which there's a motion filed. And so may I suggest that the Chair take this motion next?"



Speaker Bradley: "The Chair will give that consideration, Mr. Walsh. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 40 'nays', 6 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr. Walsh, we have no other motion at the Clerk's desk. They tell me they don't have the motion, sir. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Huskey just delivered a motion a few moments ago as I did. We have both sponsored Death Penalty Bills and the motions were handed to the Clerk two minutes ago. They're over in the basket."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we simply suspend the rule that provides that they must be on the Calendar for one day. That would be the expedient thing to do."

Speaker Bradley: "That would be the motion that we would have to have before we could address ourselves to that..."

Walsh: "Well, I make that motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "...issue and we don't... You're so moving."

Walsh: "I'm told the rule I'm suspending is Rule 66(b)."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, sir and it takes 107 votes and the Gentleman so moves that we suspend the Calendar requirement for both Bills, Mr. Walsh, or do you want..."

Walsh: "Both Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, House Bill 74, Mr. Huskey; House Bill 251, Representative Deuster, on the motion to discharge our Calendar requirement. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, sir."

Yourell: "Were these two Bills that we're going to be asked to move on now, did either one of them receive a vote in Committee or are they still in Committee?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster or the Chairman or Mr. Huskey wish to



respond? Let's call on... I think we ought to call on the Chairman of the Committee, Representative Katz, for an explanation, Mr. Katz, of the posture the Bills are in."

Katz: "The other two Bills are in Committee. A Roll Call was had with regard to 251, not with regard to 74 but testimony was taken with regard to both Bills and all three of them were in Committee as of this morning."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I think that we're doing something here that we might be doing wrong because if a Bill is in Committee and hasn't received a vote of that Committee, I don't know how you can discharge the Committee when the Committee has not taken any action yet. And I'd like a ruling from the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Yourell, the rule says as long as the Bill has not been reported back to the House, this... do not pass, this motion by Representative Walsh is a proper motion."

Yourell: "All right. Further inquiry. Does one Bill, the Deuster Bill take 89 votes and the other Bill 107?"

Speaker Bradley: "On which motion, sir? It takes 107 motions to address ourselves to the Calendar requirement to... for that motion to be sustained. It will take 89 votes at that time to discharge the Committee. We're not to that point yet, sir."

Yourell: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Back to the Gentleman's motion. All those in favor of Mr. Walsh's motion to suspend the Calendar requirement that the motion be on the Calendar will vote 'aye'. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had a motion that I brought to the floor of the House and I thought that we'd get started in this Session and be able to talk back and forth, make agreements with people on both sides of the aisle. I had an objection, I understand this one doesn't take unanimous consent, but I think I object to this and I hope that the people on my side of the aisle will object to it also so that we can have some mutual agreements made and carry on a good Session and everybody try to bend to appease each other to get this



workload out of the way. So I would hope that this side of the aisle would support my objection."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, we will now vote on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay' and it'll take 107 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to make perfectly clear that I did not support the motion of Mr. Kosinski because I felt that there was time for the Committee to act on all three of these Bills. Now since it was the will of this House not to do that, not to permit that Committee to do that, apparently because as Mr. Kosinski pointed out, the Committee was unfavorable generally toward the concept, then there is just no point at all in leaving the Bills of two other Members in the Committee because they are not going to get out of there."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman between the Chair and Mr. Walsh please sit down? Thank you. Proceed, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "It's all right, he's the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. It seems unfair indeed..."

Speaker Bradley: "I'd like to be able to see you, sir."

Walsh: "It seems unfair, Mr. Speaker, for this House to deny the same privilege to two of its Members that it has given another Member under identical circumstances and I think that we ought to put these Bills on the Calendar if we put that one on."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hursey, Huskey... It's hard to see these names up here: Mr. Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, actually we're not asking now for a vote whether this be a vote on the death penalty. The only thing we're asking for is that we give, be given the same fair chance for our Bills to be heard on this House floor as you have just given the former Representative. In fact, I voted for his Bill to be relieved of Committee and I would hope that you would give me the same consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think that the principle that



many of us voted on the prior motion for is involved here and I would like to notify the Chair or request of the Chair that if this motion fails that you recognize me immediately after the vote so that I, as one who voted in favor of the previous motion, may move to reconsider the vote by which it passed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is true that three different Members developed their own approach to the death penalty proposal and presented them to the Committee. Initially it was my feeling as a Sponsor that I would prefer to have the Committee thoroughly go into this subject and I even had a conversation with Representative Getty that I thought it might be appropriate for all of the Bills, I would certainly be willing with mine, to put it into a Subcommittee to make sure that any technical problems or any constitutional problems were ironed out. I was in no rush as a Sponsor to bring my Bill to the House floor, but recognizing that it has subsequently developed to be the will of this Body to bring it out, bring one Bill out and leave the others there, I supported Representative Kosinski's motion. And I support his Death Penalty Bill and I respect the right of any Sponsor to develop Bills and bring them before the Committee. But since we have sprung one Bill out, I think there are different approaches to death penalty that are presented in the other Bills. And I might say specifically the Bill I sponsored had a provision in there recognized the aspect of human error to allow a convicted killer to defer the date of his death a few years to protect against the possibility of human error. But I think it's only fair that if we were going to adopt one procedural approach on this subject, we ought to take that procedural approach with all three Bills. So I urge your vote to bring the other two Bills out. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. On a point of order, state your point, sir."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I might as well make it now because I guess others will abuse it. He's gone way over the limit



on explanation of his vote. He spoke on the Bill rather than the motion and I think we ought to live up to the rules."

Speaker Bradley: "We're trying to apply them, sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I thank you for helping me discharge House Bill 10 from Committee. But I think fair is fair. I'm certain in the final analysis we'll want to consider all this legislation, whether we're in the court or not in the court will be determined on Third Reading. These Bills are not in jeopardy. They would appear on the Calendar tomorrow in terms of a motion. But if the Sponsor wishes to force that at this time, I'm in accord. I think we should hear every Capital Punishment Bill possible and pass to the Senate that which we think is the exemplary one. I would recommend to those people who are voting red that they switch their votes to green and that we get all of this on to the House floor."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as early as it is in this Session, do you mean to tell me that a Vice-chairman of a Committee is going to recommend to this House that Bills as important as the death penalty not be given a full Committee hearing, that we ought to bring them all out on the floor of the House without a full Committee hearing. If that be true, then I would say to you that a question is... I don't know of any question more important than a human life. That if this is going to be the attitudes of Committees, that we do not give the death penalty which takes a human life, a full Committee hearing, then we ought to abolish all Committees and let's debate all of the Bills here on the floor of this House."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, the Minority Leader, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm somewhat disappointed at the majority of this House holding back Republican Bills in a partisan manner this early in the



Session, especially after the speech we just heard from the Governor of the State of Illinois. And I would at this time, make a personal plea to the Speaker who's indicated to me that there would be none of this and to the Majority Leader of the House that he either put Representative Kosinski's Bill back in Committee or let the two Republican Bills out on the floor. And I would urge all of the Republican Members if we can't get that done, to withhold any support from the Republican side of the aisle until such time as we can get some equity."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the words that were just echoed by Representative Ryan are a statement of truth because I think there should be a certain amount of responsibility on both sides of the aisle. I sat in Judiciary II yesterday and I just want to compliment the Chairman and the Members of that Committee of discussing this issue and, in turn, having two public hearings here in Springfield--one as the proponents and opponents on this measure. As it was pointed out by the, by Representative Kosinski, his Bill fell a few votes short as far as the majority of the Committee in passage. This House in its wisdom discharged that Committee. There are two other Bills presently on the death proposition in that Committee. One was heard in Committee and the other one was postponed. But in all fairness, I believe that all three should be discharged and, in turn, let everybody make up their mind which Bill they're going to be supporting. And I would strongly recommend an 'aye' vote at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd. Mr. Simms, did you wish to address..."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, after hearing the remarks of Representative Kosinski and one of my leaders on this side of the aisle, I apologize for my earlier remarks in regard to cooperation of this House. And I'm going to vote to discharge because I think these Bills are important. It's going to save time if we can hear them all three on the House floor. I'm going to change



my vote to green in the interest of cooperation and I hope all the other people will do likewise. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 116 'ayes', 31 'nays', 3 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr., the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, leave for the same Roll Call on the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, same Roll Call on 74, the same Roll Call for 251. What was your motion, sir? Was it..."

Walsh: "My motion was that we use the same Roll Call for the motions that are filed and that we take them together. Representative Deuster and Huskey..."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, fine. Then we're in a posture where we have discharged the Committee on those two Bills. Right, that's where we are. Thank you, sir. On the Calendar on the Order of Third Reading appears House Bill... Mr. Huskey, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Huskey: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Was the Roll Call to relieve House Bill 74 and 251 from the Committee?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, sir. That was the... he asked for leave and there were no objections, so those two Bills will appear on the Calendar as being discharged from that Committee. Yes, sir."

Huskey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "They will appear on the Calendar as being on Second Reading, First Legislative Day. On the Calendar appears, Third Reading, appears House Bill 24. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to call House Bill 24 back to Second Reading for the purposes of... Jane Barnes has a motion that she would like to make."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing none, we'll return the Bill... Just a minute. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. Is it your Amendment, sir?"

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, I think what I'm asking here is that we bring,



that Jane Barnes has a motion that she would like to offer and I have no objections to this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Telcser. Are there objections? Hearing none, we'll return the Bill to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment and we'll, the Amendment... the Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."

J. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the Roll Call vote by which Amendment #1 was rejected."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves to reconsider the Roll Call vote on Amendment #1 to House Bill 24. All in favor of the Lady's motion say 'aye'. The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Point of information. What is Amendment #1?"

Speaker Bradley: "Ms. Barnes, would you explain Amendment #1 please?"

J. Barnes: "Yes, that was Representative Cunningham's Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Cunningham, would you give us an explanation and enlighten us."

Cunningham: "As the Chair ruled that it's... the motion to reconsider has been granted, carried. Well do so and I'll explain it. The motion is to allocate sixteen million dollars from the Public Transport Fund to R.T.A. for the benefit of the whole area. It's by agreement."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, seems to have some concern."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, did the Gentleman say that the Amendment reduces by eight million dollars... What the Amendment does, I believe, is reduce the appropriation of the Bill by eight million dollars. Is that correct, Representative Cunningham?"

Cunningham: "What I said was that the Amendment allocates or appropriates sixteen million to R.T.A. from the Public Transport Fund. Now, the original Bill had a different figure in there. The original Bill had a figure of twenty-four million dollars."

Telcser: "Strike twenty-four and it makes it sixteen."

Cunningham: "And it puts in sixteen in the Amendment."

Telcser: "All right."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair. The motion that is being made by Representative Barnes, as I understand it, relates to House Bill 24. I notice by my Calendar, House Bill 24 is on Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "We have brought it back to Second Reading."

Madison: "All right, the other question that I have, Mr. Speaker, relates to the motion itself. I can understand the propriety of a motion to reconsider the vote by which an Amendment was adopted. I have some difficulty understanding the propriety of a motion to reconsider the vote by which an Amendment was lost. It would seem to me that the procedure would be if it's back on Second Reading to simply reintroduce the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "She wants to offer the identical Amendment from what the Chair understands and that's... a necessity."

Madison: "The question I'm raising is whether or not it is necessary to offer a motion to reconsider. The Amendment lost."

Speaker Bradley: "On a record vote, it is necessary to do that, sir."

Madison: "Then this was a record vote?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, sir."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "And we're going to have a record vote on this, on the Lady's motion now to reconsider. All those in favor of the Lady's... sorry, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Right, the assertion has been made that the deal is cut here. This is an agreed Amendment. I don't know who the agreement was made between. Perhaps Representative Garmisa and Representative Cunningham. I would point out, however, that while this Amendment certainly should be adopted, that there is another choice on Third Reading coming up. The Governor has proposed seventy-five million dollars for high school and elementary school state aid education increase. And we will find if enough people file Bills that subsequent to House Bill 24, will be filed House Bill 524 which will rip \$24.4 million out of the Public Transportation Fund and put it into the Common School Fund. And I would suggest that people not rush..."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevec, on a point of order. Pardon me, Mr. Skinner."

Matijevec: "I think he's through; but he was out of order. So, let's go on with the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor of this motion yield to just a short question?"

Speaker Bradley: "Ms. Barnes, would you answer a short question from Mr. Ewell?"

Ewell: "My only concern is that we're going to take this down to sixteen million. What are we going to do with the other eight million?"

J. Barnes: "Representative, it's not legally in the fund."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, at the time that this Bill was prepared the best estimates available from the Bureau of the Budget indicated that there would be \$24 million in the Mass Transit Fund to be moved to the R.T.A. Today those estimates have been revised to a figure of sixteen million dollars and this Amendment simply brings the level of appropriation in this Bill into line with the best estimates available by the Bureau of the Budget."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady's motion, all in favor of the Lady's motion will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question... it's still open. Would you get Mr. Skinner on? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. 147 'ayes' and 1 voting 'nay' and the Lady's motion prevails. On the Amendment, Mrs. Barnes."

J. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you the chief Sponsor of that Amendment or is it Mr. Cunningham? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Speaker, I'm very happy to yield to Jane as being the mover of the Amendment. I urge it to each of the Members of the floor. I thank the Majority Leader for his excellent



explanation and Representative Garmisa for the realism that he's brought to this matter, his statesmanship. So, I join Jane Barnes in urging we all vote for the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 24. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the rules require if an Amendment was adopted by a record vote, it must be or was defeated by a record vote, it must be a record vote to record it. It's Rule 62(b), I believe. Motion to reconsider."

Speaker Bradley: "This is not a motion to reconsider. This is a motion to adopt the Amendment."

Totten: "An Amendment adopted, the rule says, 'A motion to reconsider a record vote and the adoption of an Amendment may be made at any time but the vote on reconsideration shall require a record vote'."

Speaker Bradley: "We've already done that. We have a record vote on the reconsideration motion by Mrs. Barnes. Mr. Cunningham is moving the adoption of Amendment #1 and you have a right to ask a Roll Call if you wish, sir. Hearing none, the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. On the Calendar appears, under Third Reading appears House Bill 27. Mr. Ebbesen."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 27. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 123. Mr. Klosak. Out of the record. 171, Mr. Kelly on Third Reading. Take it out of the record. Mr. Ewing on 244. Read it a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 244. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take that Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests that we return the Bill to



Second Reading. Are there objections? Hearing none, we'll return the Bill to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Schuneman. Amends House Bill 244 on page 2 by deleting line 2 and 3 and inserting in lieu thereof and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schuneman on the Amendment."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 would amend House Bill 244 so that people entitled to the homestead exemption would receive that tax exemption in the year in which they become 65 years of age. This is basically the same Bill that was passed by the House last year, passed by the Senate and was finally vetoed by the Governor. And we're making another attempt this year. Now, what we're attempting to do by means of this Amendment is to provide the tax relief in the year in which the taxpayer attains age 65. And I would move the adoption of Amendment #1."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I humbly request a fiscal note on the Amendment."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, the fiscal impact of the Amendment would be to reduce the fiscal impact of the Bill because the Amendment provides that only taxpayers whose birthday occurs prior to July 1 in any one year be allowed the exemption, whereas the Bill itself would allow taxpayers whose birthday occurs at any time during the year to have the exemption. So actually, the fiscal impact is to reduce the total fiscal impact of the Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't believe that really addresses itself to the issue and we heard the Governor point out to the Members of this General Assembly and the people of Illinois in his comments and State of the State and budget presentation that from now on, we're going to have what it's going to cost the local municipalities in the counties in this state before we mandate any programs.



And my question asks specifically what it's going to cost the counties and the municipalities in this state in loss in revenue with the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schuneman, Mr. Skinner says he can answer that. If you'll yield to Mr. Skinner?"

Schuneman: "Yeah, I'll yield to Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, first of all one has to put it into context. The Property Tax Bill in the State of Illinois is approximately three billion dollars. This is going to cost a maximum six million dollars. Now if you spread that out, is so far under 1%, no one will be able to notice the difference."

Lechowicz: "I would like to know what it's going to cost Cook County specifically."

Skinner: "Cook County pays approximately half the property taxes, so it would cost about three million dollars of the Cook County levy."

Lechowicz: "I oppose the Amendment."

Skinner: "You really hate senior citizens, I guess."

Lechowicz: "No, I love them very much but in turn, I think, you know... Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll address myself to the Amendment as far as the difficulties, if I may."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, sir. Mr. Schuneman is... for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentlemen are addressing themselves to the Bill, not to the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "...until Mr. Lechowicz started..."

Schuneman: "Well Mr. Lechowicz has been addressing himself to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, he just said he would like to address himself to the Amendment."

Schuneman: "Fine."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Sponsor of the Amendment pointed out that in turn it would just affect the senior citizens, Representative Skinner, if they have their birthday before July 1 of the respective year. May I point out to this



Body the difficulty in the administration of that procedure and especially if you have a system where you go out on a pre-payment of a tax bill. It'll be absolutely horrendous. May I point out on page 20 of the Governor's statement to this Body and all the taxpayers of Illinois, 'Whatever the problems are, however, there is plainly no excuse for telling local communities whose financial resources are in reality finite, that they must carry out state mandated programs without sufficient financial help.' That's what you're doing here. Not only are you imposing a serious financial restraint on local communities, but you're imposing a very difficult administrative procedure in compliance of this Act and I would hope that Amendment #1 is defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Member from the other side of the aisle, I think, was quite correct in requesting a fiscal note. However, I don't believe our rules allow us to request a fiscal note on an Amendment. I would like to request a fiscal note on the Bill now that we have it on Second Reading and whether this Amendment is put on or not."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten, are you requesting a fiscal note at this time?"

Totten: "On the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten, would you come down to the Clerk's desk and make that request in writing, sir? Mr. Totten, Mr. Lechowicz is now filing that motion, so could we leave the Bill on Second Reading until we get a fiscal note... Mr. Ewing, what..."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that the rule has any application to this Bill because this is not concerning the expenditure of state funds and I think the request which Mr. Totten made does not apply to this Bill and I'd like a ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "Our Parliamentarian is consulting with the statutes and he'll be right back. Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I think we've gotten into a discussion on the merits of the Bill rather than the merits of the Amendment."



And I would ask a ruling from the Chair as to the propriety of requesting a fiscal note on the Amendment itself."

Speaker Bradley: "I think he did not... he did not file a motion on the Amendment. He filed a fiscal note request on the Bill at the Second Reading stage and that's where we find ourselves right now. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. It appears to me that notwithstanding the fiscal note request that has no application to what we are considering now which is Amendment #1. And I would think that we could still move on Amendment #1 up or down."

Speaker Bradley: "You're correct, sir. We want... if the Sponsor wants to proceed with Amendment #1, we can adopt or reject the Amendment and then we will determine at that time whether we're going to leave it on Second Reading and wait for the fiscal note or whether we'll move it to Third Reading, but right now, Mr. Schuneman, is it your Amendment now, sir? Proceed with the Amendment, sir, or did you explain it already?"

Schuneman: "I did explain the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Would you like to so move the adoption then, sir?"

Schuneman: "I would like to close if I might."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "By simply stating that if you any objection at all to the Bill and to the fiscal implications of the Bill, Amendment #1 would make the Bill less objectionable to you because it will reduce the fiscal impact of the Bill itself. And I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 244."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 244. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me just point out to you the inadequacies of Amendment #1 and that's as far as the administration procedure that would be imposed on every county that has



a real estate tax bill as far as the imposition of this cut-off procedure of July 1. And as far as the impact of an additional fifty percent and I would hope that the Membership would take cognizance of the fact of the, as the Governor addressed us this afternoon, of what we're doing here--mandating a specific program and in turn, impacting it by fifty percent. Telling them it's got to be done when you've got a very difficult procedure in getting these real estate tax bills out on time to begin with. Now you're imposing another burden, a very difficult burden in administration and I strongly recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Sponsor. If this motion fails, the Bill will then stand such that if anyone turned 65 at any time within the year, then they're eligible for the exemption. Is that correct if the motion fails?"

Speaker Bradley: "You're requesting a... if the Amendment fails... Mr. Schuneman."

Bowman: "How will the Bill..."

Schuneman: "Yes, if the Amendment fails, then a person becoming 65 at any time during the year would be eligible for the homestead exemption. What we're attempting to do by means of this Amendment is to cut it off at about the time the tax bills are put out which are July 1 or prior to that."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 90 'ayes', 47 'nays' and 2 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "We're going to hold the Bill on Second Reading for the purpose of the fiscal note. The statutes or... Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "When the fiscal note is determined by the Department of Revenue, I trust the Department of Revenue or whoever does it will point out the savings to the state through lower circuit



breaker grants to senior citizens in that first year."

Speaker Bradley: "The Sponsor of the Bill can talk with the Department about that. On the Calendar on Third Reading appears House Bill 250. The Gentleman... read it a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 250. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Securities Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 250 would simply provide that a registered broker-dealer could act as a custodian of investment fund shares. Registered broker-dealers are authorized today to act as the custodian of the normal stocks or bonds of a large corporation but they don't have the authority to hold investment fund shares in their custody. This Bill would simply extend that authority to the broker-dealer. The Bill was passed by this House during the last Session but never enacted into law because of certain technical problems and I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yeah, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he would."

Kempiners: "Mike, was this the Bill that you referred to, the one that you and John Grotberg were working on an Amendment or a number of Amendments on... I can't remember the number but it was a pretty detailed Bill."

Madigan: "The matters which Representative Grotberg was interested in are no longer in the Bill although the synopsis refers to them. They were amended out."

Kempiners: "...concerned about with regard to the community..."

Madigan: "That's no longer in the Bill."

Kempiners: "That's no longer in the Bill."

Madigan: "It was amended out in Committee."

Kempiners: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor will signify by



voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 128 'ayes', no 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Pardon me, we've got some Agreed Resolutions. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 91, VonBoeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "House Resolution 91 by VonBoeckman honors the Broadmoor Intermediate School of Pekin. They won the Class B state tournament. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Houlihan: "Representative Giorgi, does this have anything to do with the contest in the basketball tournament that is now pending before the courts?"

Giorgi: "Where at? Where's the tournament being held?"

Houlihan: "Representative Giorgi, does this Resolution which you are sponsoring..."

Giorgi: "No, no..."

Houlihan: "Pardon?"

Giorgi: "My voice says 'no'."

Houlihan: "Would you take it out of the record until we can check this?"

Giorgi: "I don't think it's necessary for VonBoeckman."

Houlihan: "Zeke, this is a serious matter."

Giorgi: "The answer is 'no'."

Houlihan: "Is that your answer or is that Jack Hill's friend, Lee Schwartz?"

Giorgi: "Gentleman from your district."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions. Representative Giorgi's moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative T. Miller. Agreed Resolutions are adopted."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a motion on the Clerk's desk to waive the requirements of Rules 18(k), the six and a half day posting rule to allow House Bill 226 to be heard in the Executive Committee tomorrow. I move its adoption."



Speaker Redmond: "Are there objections? Hearing no objections...
Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, what was the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Repeat the motion, Mr. Miller."

Miller: "The motion is to waive the six and a half day posting rule on House Bill 226. For the last two weeks, I have been endeavoring to get that posted in Committee and due to a clerical error it has not been posted and I'm requesting that it be heard tomorrow in Executive Committee."

Lechowicz: "I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Objections have been raised. Representative VanDuynes."

VanDuynes: "Mr. Speaker, am I to understand, going through the Agreed Resolutions that you're going to adjourn shortly?"

Speaker Redmond: "Very shortly. We'll be in perfunct for five minutes and then we will recess or adjourn till tomorrow at twelve o'clock."

VanDuynes: "Well, I have House Bill 299 on Second Reading. Is there any reason why it isn't read the second time and passed on to Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, the House and Senate have a... soon to be filed in the Supreme Court tomorrow and Enrolling and Engrossing are doing the work and they requested that we do not have Second Reading. That's the reason. Representative Miller."

Miller: "Mr. Chairman, I am going to move that the House waive this posting rule with regard to House Bill 226. The Bill calls for allocating a two thousand dollar automobile expense for Members of the General Assembly. There are three other Bills being heard tomorrow in that Committee. I have endeavored to play according to the rules in getting that Bill heard and the Committee has failed twice to post that Bill. Now, I request that this House vote upon my motion to suspend the rules of 18(k) to allow it to be heard tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that it must be in writing and that if you do not have unanimous consent, it can't be heard today. It would have to go on the Calendar. Representative Telcser."



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now. Are you in support or you antagonistic or do you..."

Telcser: "I'm not antagonistic to anyone, Mr. Speaker, today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller differs. Representative Miller."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, that motion is in writing and it's on your desk."

Speaker Redmond: "It's not on the Calendar. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what, you know, what the action is between Representative Miller and the Chairman or Majority Leader but, Mr. Speaker, I do know that with the onset of the Session, there must be some new Committee Clerks around because they are failing to post Bills. I think it's a clerical error. It's not intentional. No one is saying that it is. I know I had a Bill that was inadvertently left off of a posting. Apparently it's the same with Representative Miller. There's no partisan implication intended but if it's simply a clerical error for two weeks in a row, I don't know why a Member shouldn't have his Bill heard. We're not trying to bypass the Committee or avoid a six and a half day posting rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Miller, last week, his Bill was inadvertently not posted for the Committee meeting last week. He rose on this floor and had approval for that Bill to be heard. The Committee did not hear the group of Bills and therefore, this week again, his Bill is not posted. So I would urge you to accept what he is saying as it should be heard along with this group and he has done everything I know to have it posted. It is nothing more than a clerical error."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I wasn't seeking to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. If Representative Miller got approval from this floor last week to have the Bill posted and it still was not heard, is it necessary for him to ask approval to have it posted again? It seems to me that if



he got approval once, that's that as far as..."

Speaker Redmond: "As far as the public is concerned, it's been the policy of the House that we have six and a half day posting. It's not for the convenience of the Members or the Clerk. It's for the, for the convenience of the press and the public. That's the problem."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if I'm understanding Representative Kent, Representative Miller got approval from this floor to have the Bill heard. It appears to me that once that has, approval has been given, it is not necessary for approval to be given again if the Committee fails to hear the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I think under the rules, if they fail to hear it, you're supposed to post again. Representative Lechowicz."

Madison: "No, no. That's not true."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe Representative Kent's explanation clarified the matter in my mind and I believe that once the Bill is posted, you don't have to post it once again according to the old rules. And in turn, I think it was a clerical error and I withdraw my objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any other objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman moves that the posting notice be suspended. Takes 100 votes, all those in favor vote 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Barnes."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of an announcement if that's in order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

E. Barnes: "For the purpose of an announcement. Appropriations Committee II which was scheduled to start at two o'clock will begin immediately upon adjournment of today's Session in Room 118. I urge the Members to be there promptly. We only have one Bill. We can get right in and out immediately in Room 118 after Session right today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."



Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an announcement. Judiciary I will meet in Room C1 immediately after adjournment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Veterans Affairs and Registration and Regulation will meet in Room 310 at 4 p.m. for a weekly get-together. And that's right over here, the old press room on the third floor, our new meeting room. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For the purposes of an announcement. The Appropriations I Committee will meet immediately after adjournment in Room 114. We have two Bills and the meeting should be very quick."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wanted to take this time to make an announcement. Since we no longer, many of us no longer believe in things like birthday Resolutions and other ways of wasting money that allegedly belongs to the taxpayers, I wanted to take this time to make an announcement without putting it in Resolution form. Today is the birthday of one of our illustrious new Members and I thought perhaps we should all wish her a happy birthday. Even while she is a fiscal conservative, she would not want us wasting money. Today is happy birthday to Representative Penny Pullen from the 4th District."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler, do you have an announcement to make with respect to today. I saw something in the paper this morning. They tell me it's Representative Schisler's birthday also. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of an announcement. I would like to remind the Members of the Environmental, Energy and Natural Resources Committee that the regular Committee time of 2 p.m. tomorrow has been changed to 9 a.m. and I understand we're going to have morning meetings from here out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have another illustrious Member who had a birthday and he had it Monday. He wouldn't tell me how old he is but that's our Assistant Minority Leader, Gilbert Deavers. And I understand he's got a lot of anonymous cards."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Elections Committee will meet in D1 in the State Office Building immediately after adjournment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins with an announcement with respect to Tulane."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I made that for you when you were off the floor. Marquette did win, I believe it was 63 to 54 or something like that but the reason I rose, Mr. Speaker, I heard you mention that it was Representative Schisler's birthday and I wanted to inquire as to the state of his health. He wasn't able to make the Elections Committee meeting Friday or Monday and it was stated that he was excused because you decided he was sick, Mr. Speaker. I told the Chairman I didn't know where you got your M.D. However, I did know that you got your B.S. at Marquette."

Speaker Redmond: "He was sick contemplating the birthday. Representative McLendon."

McLendon: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Personnel and Pensions Committee will meet promptly at 4 p.m. in Room D. I'd appreciate the presence of all Members."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Counties and Townships will meet right after adjournment in Room 310, our beautiful new hearing room in the third floor of the Capitol Building here and I would appreciate an early attendance so we can get out as quickly as possible. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Madigan. Representative... pardon me, Representative Madigan, will you yield to Representative VonBoeckman? Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Motor Vehicles Committee will



meet tomorrow at 9 o'clock in Room 122B."

Speaker Redmond: "General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 92, Holewinski. House Resolution 93, Taylor. And House Joint Resolution 11, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn for a perfunctory for fifteen minutes and then to twelve o'clock tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. We'll be in perfunct for fifteen minutes at which time we'll adjourn till twelve o'clock tomorrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate passed the Bill of the following title and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bill #22, passed by the Senate March 2, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate passed the Bill of the following title, passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bill 78, passed by the Senate March 2, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Joint Resolution #20, adopted by the Senate March 2, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Introduction and First Reading. House Bill 511, Mahar. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act codifying the powers and duties Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 512, Rigney. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to rate of interest and other charges in connection with sales on credit and lending of money. First Reading of the Bill."



House Bill 513, Schlickman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 514, Peggy Smith Martin. A Bill for an Act to provide a system of accelerating the names and addresses of trustees and all beneficial owners, a system of ascertaining the names and addresses of trustees and all beneficial owners of certain property held in land trust. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 515, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 516, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 517, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 518, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 519, Yourell. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 520, Jim Houlihan. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 521, DiPrima. A Bill for an Act relating to beverage containers and amending Acts named therein. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 522, Polk. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the acquisition of the Illinois and Mississippi Canal. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 523, Polk. A Bill for an Act to take House Bill 523 out of the record. House Bill 524, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 525, Skinner. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Common School Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 526, Schneider. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 527, Giglio. A Bill for an Act authorizing counties to provide urban service throughout the county and in parts of the county and protect public health, safety and general welfare. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 528, Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fish Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 529, Mudd. A Bill for an Act



to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 530, Mudd. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the Cook County Police and Corrections Merit Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 531, Mudd. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the County Police Department Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 532, Mudd. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 533, Getty. A Bill for an Act to register all facilities which store hazardous materials. First Reading of the Bill. Back to House Bill 523, Levin. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 534, J. David Jones. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 535, Capparelli. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 534, the Sponsor was J. Davis rather than Jones. House Bill 536, John Dunn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 537, John Dunn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Drainage Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 538, John Dunn. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to recorders. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 539, Lucco. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the compensation of Members of the General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 540, Katz. A Bill for an Act in relation to regulatory agencies and their termination. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 541, Schneider. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Introduction and First Reading of Constitutional Amendments. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #20, Ralph Dunn. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state for



adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 5 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IX, Section 5. Personal Property Taxation. (a) The General Assembly by law may classify personal property for purposes of taxation by valuation, abolish such taxes on any or all classes and authorize the levy of taxes in lieu of the taxation of personal property by valuation. (b) Any ad valorem personal property tax abolished on or before the effective date of this Constitution shall not be reinstated. (c) On or before January 1, 1989, the General Assembly by law shall abolish all ad valorem personal property taxes and concurrently therewith and thereafter shall replace all revenue lost by units of local government and school districts as a result of the abolition of ad valorem personal property taxes subsequent to January 2, 1971. Such revenue shall be replaced by imposing statewide taxes, other than ad valorem taxes on real estate, solely on those classes relieved of the burden of paying ad valorem personal property taxes because of the abolition of such taxes subsequent to January 3, 1971. If any taxes imposed for such replacement purposes are taxes on or measured by income, such replacement taxes shall not be considered for purposes of the limitations of one tax and the ratio of 8 to 5 set forth in Section 3(a) of this Article. No page 2. Take the Constitutional Amendment out of the record. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	9 11:45	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Clerk O'Brien	Prayer	
	Spe	Speaker Redmond	Recess till after Joint Session Joint Session in order	
		Doorkeeper	Senate enters	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Doorkeeper		
	11:55	Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
2		President Hynes		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Rev. Krueger	Prayer	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Moves J.S.R. #1	
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted	
	12:00	Doorkeeper	Governor enters	
		Speaker Redmond		
3		President Hynes	Intro. Jane Thompson	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Governor Thompson	State of State message	
		Speaker Redmond		
	12:43	President Hynes	Moves Joint Session arise	
		Speaker Redmond		
	12:50	Speaker Bradley	House in order	
		Madigan	Excused absences	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2!
18		Epton	Excused Absences	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Collins		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate	
19		Speaker Bradley		
	12:52	Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports	
	S	Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction and 1st Reading	
		Speaker Bradley		
20		Kosinski	Motion on H.B. 10	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Katz		
21		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich		
22		Speaker Bradley		
		Waddell	Question	
		Kosinski	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mann		
23		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman	Oppose motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
24	1:09	Davis		
		Speaker Bradley		
	a	Kosinski	Objects	
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	3.
		Davis	Continues	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Sandquist	Oppose motion	
25		Speaker Bradley		
		Lauer	Support motion	
26		Speaker Bradley		
		Daniels		
27		Speaker Bradley		
		Sindquist	Point of Order	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Daniels	Continues	
	1:14	Speaker Bradley		
		McAuliffe		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Davis	Objects	
28		Speaker Bradley		
		McAuliffe		
		Speaker Bradley		
		McAuliffe	Continues	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar	Moves previous question	
		Speaker Bradley		
29		Kosinski	To close	
	1:18	Speaker Bradley		
		Meyer		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Walsh		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	4.
30		Speaker Bradley	Motion to discharge Com. on H.B. 10 prevails	
	1:20	Deuster		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Walsh	Discussion on Rule 66d	
		Speaker Bradley	Discussion	
		Yourell	Inquiry of Chair	
		Speaker Bradley		
31		Katz	Explanation	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Asks ruling of Chair	
		Speaker Bradley	Discussion	
		Mudd		
32		Speaker Bradley		
		Walsh	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
	1:27	Huskey		
		Bradley		
		Kempiners	Move to reconsider	
33		Speaker Bradley		
	1:29	Deuster		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich	Point of Order	
34		Speaker Bradley		
		Kosinski		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Davis		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ryan		
35		Speaker Bradley		
		Lechowicz	Supports motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mudd	change to green	
36		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails	
		Walsh		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Walsh	Motion to use same roll call	
	1:37	Speaker Bradley		
	ii	Huskey	Inquiry of Chair	
		Speaker Bradley	Discussion H.B. 24, 3rd Reading	
		Garmisa	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Garmisa		
		Speaker Bradley	Return to 2nd Reading	
		J. Barnes	Move to reconsider vote on Amendment #1 - H.B. 24	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis	Point of Information	
37		Speaker Bradley		
		J. Barnes	Explains	
		Speaker Bradley		
	1:40	Cunningham	Explains	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser	Question	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	6.
	1:40	Cunningham	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
38		Madison	Inquiry of Chair	
		Speaker Bradley	Discussion	
		Skinner		
39		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich	Point of Order	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ewell	Question	
		J. Barnes	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails	
		J. Barnes	Moves to adopt Amendment	
		Speaker Bradley		
	1:46	Cunningham	Urge adoption	
40		Speaker Brailey		
	1:47	Totten	Rule 62B	
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #1 adopted, 3rd Reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 27, 3rd Reading	
		Speaker Bradley	Take out of record	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 244, 3rd Reading	
		Ewing	Leave to return to 2nd Reading	
		Speaker Bradley	Returned to 2nd	
41		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Bradley		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
		Schuneman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Lechowicz	Requests fiscal note	
		Shuneman	Replies	
		Speaker Bradley		
	L;50	Lechowicz		
42		Speaker Bradley		
		Schuneman	Yield to Skinner	
	1:51	Skinner		
		Lechowicz	Discussion	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schuneman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Lechowicz		
43		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten	Requests fiscal note on Bill	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ewing	Asks for ruling of Chair	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schuneman	Asks for ruling of Chair	
44		Speaker Bradley		
		Madison	Inquiry of Chair	
		Speaker Bradley		
	1:55	Schuneman	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Lechowicz		
45		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
		Bowman	Question	
		Schuneman		
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted Hold on 2nd Reading	
	2:00	Skinner		
46		Speaker Bradley	Discussion	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.B. 250, 3rd Reading	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kempiners	Yield	
		Madigan		
		Speaker Bradley	H.B. 250, passed	
47		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Giorgi		
		J. Houlikar	Question	
	2:05	Giorgi	Discussion	
		Speaker Redmond	Agreed Resolutions	
		T. Miller	Motion on H.B. 226	
48		Speaker Redmond		
		Lechowicz	Question	
		Miller	Repeats motion	
		Lechowicz	Ojbecks	
		Speaker Redmond		
		VanDuyne	Question	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
		VanDuyne		
		Speaker Redmond	Discussion	
		Miller	Asks posting rule be waived	
		Speaker Redmond	Must be in writing	
49		Telcser		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Miller		
		Telcser		
		Speaker Redmond		
2	2:10	Kent		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Mann		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madison	Parliamentary Inquiry	
50		Speaker Redmond	Discussion	
		Lechowicz	Withdraws objection	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion prevails	
		E. Barnes	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
51		Mann	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:14	DiPrima	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Kozubowski	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
	2:15	Keats	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
		Flinn	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
52		Geo-Karis	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Laurino	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Collins	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McLendon	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Yourell	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		VonBoeckman	Announcement	
53		Speaker Redmond		
	2:17	Clerk O'Brien	Resolutions	
		Speaker Redmond	Committee on Assignments	
		Madigan	Move to recess for a perfunct, 12:00-Thurs	
	2:20	Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate	
54, 55, 56			Introduction and 1st Reading H.J.R.C.A. #2-out of record	
	2:31		House adjourned	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES