

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery . . . . Members of the House, the House will convene in ten minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. The Members please be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Angelique Arnauld said, 'Perfection consists not in doing extraordinary things, but in doing ordinary things extraordinarily well'. Let us pray for perfection. Heavenly Father, we come to Thee this morning as we begin another day of service to Thee as the elected Representatives of the people of the State of Illinois. The great issues of life and death, crime and punishment, peace and tranquility, and the general welfare of Thy people in this state are ours to consider. We need Thy special gift, O Lord, to do that which is perfect in Thy sight, well-pleasing to Thee and, thus, beneficial for all mankind. We are weak and imperfect, Father, but in that knowledge enable us to see the goal of perfection that it may become a reality in our action. We ask this in the name of Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Message 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 concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Preamble and Joint Resolution to wit', House Joint Resolution #12, concurred in by the Senate, March 8, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday Representative Conti's 'present' button wouldn't go on. Now, today his goes on and mine doesn't go on."

Speaker-Redmond: "I think they're giving you a message."

Geo-Karis: "I don't know. I haven't said anything. But now you're giving me incentive. I might just get even. So would you mark me



'present', Mr. Clerk? I can't put the darn thing on."

Speaker Redmond: "We put a work order in for July 1st."

Geo-Karis: "That's an excellent idea, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't agree more."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, the record will so show.

Any Republican excused absences? House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 10, the Death Penalty. Representative Kosinski on the floor? Take that out of the record. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Taylor, Chairman from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 8, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, 'do pass' House Bill 79, 'do pass as amended' House Bill 306. Representative Meyer, Chairman from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 8, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, 'do pass' House Bill 113, 'do not pass' House Bill 390. Representative Katz, Chairman from the Committee on Judiciary II to which the following Bills were referred, action taken March 8, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, 'do pass' House Bill 110, House Bill 270 and House Bill 398; 'do pass as amended' House Bill 181 and House Bill 212."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second Reading. On House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 13."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 13, a Bill for an Act in relation to coke-saving first aid . . . choke-saving first aid procedures. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 13 on page 1 by inserting between lines 17 and 18 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "1-3. Representative Capparelli on the floor? Take it out of the record. 40, Representative Griesheimer. House Bill 40."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 40, a Bill for an Act to establish a Military and Naval Code for the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill.



House Bill 40. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer on the floor? Who's the Sponsor of this Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters, is he on the floor? Take it out of the record. 65. Out of the record? Representative Greiman? Out of the record. 106, out of the record. 131, Representative Huskey on the floor? 185. Representative Luft, 185."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 185, a Bill for an Act in relation to regulatory agencies and to their termination. Second Reading of the Bill. 85. . . . 185."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative . . ."

Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading of the Bill. Two Committee Amendments. Amendment #1 amends House Bill 185 on page 1, line 31, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Committee Amendment #1 changes the initial period that the Committee will review and recommend termination of the regulatory agencies. We established in the Bill originally an October 1st date. We stretched that date out to a two-year period. And that's what the Amendment does in one instance. Or in another instance, we include the Department of Registration and Education as a regulatory agency, which we inadvertently left out. We changed the dates or time that a performance audit must be performed by the Auditor General from three months to two months before the recommended termination of the agency. And we require the audit to be submitted to the regulatory agency involved, as well as the Joint Rules Committee. We clarified legislation recommended by the Joint Rules Committee that the recommendation should be assigned to the appropriate Committee of the House. And we defined nine factors in this Amendment that the Standing Committee has to consider and determine whether an agency is been . . . has demonstrated a public need for its continued existence. If there are no questions . . . I would answer them; if there are not; I would move for adoption of this Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1."



The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', pardon me, opposed 'no'. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 amends House Bill 185 on page 2, line 34, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Luft."

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

Committee Amendment #2 simply says that the Joint Rules Committee shall review every regulatory agency at least once every six years after the initial review of that agency. If there are not questions, I'd move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 204."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 204, Willer, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Judicial Inquiry Board. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 235."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 235, Representative Sharp, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment . . . Amendment . . . amends House Bill 235 on page 1, line 1, by deleting '5.2 and 5-4' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sharp on the floor? Out of the record. 237."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 237, Kane, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 240. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, could you just hold that for a second?"

Speaker Redmond: "237?"

Lechowicz: "237."

Speaker Redmond: "What do you want to do? Bring it back to Second?"

I moved it to Third."

Lechowicz: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "What do you want, Representative Kane? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you leave that Bill on Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "243. Third Reading. 243."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 243, Representative Schlickman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay . . ."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 244."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 244, Ewing . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing on the floor? 244."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted; and this is the one we have to reconsider Amendment 2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz. Well, this is a matter that . . . Representative Lucco."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we're going to . . . could we just pass this one up for a little while?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, there's something that we have to do beforehand,



though, on . . . on 244 we'll recognize Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to make a motion. Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 to House Bill 244 was adopted. As was explained by the Chair yesterday, the vote was announced 79 to 78; when in reality it was 78 to 78. So I move that it be reconsidered."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 to House Bill 24 . . . Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I won't object with the recommendation as far as by Representative Lucco. I'd like to know from the Chair whether it was the intent of the Chair as to whether we're going to go back and read off Amendment #2 as was adopted . . . or as supposedly adopted by this House. I never went through the process of verifying the negative vote. And, in turn, I just want to make sure we each . . . every one of us has a fair shake on this one."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's obvious that the announcement was in error. because the vote was not 79-78, it was 78-78. So what we're doing here is correcting the mistake which . . . so it will be up to the Sponsor of the Amendment and the Membership what they want to do with it. What we will do, we will reconsider that vote. And then the question on the adoption of Amendment #2 will be before the Body."

Lechowicz: "With the same Amendment, Mr. Speaker? Or do I have to refile?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, providing . . . providing the . . . the votes are reconsidered carries, then it would be . . ."

Lechowicz: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . so the question's on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 to House Bill 244 was adopted. Those in favor . . . Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would first like to challenge whether we had . . . whether we had a prevailing side. When an Amendment has a tie vote, it's considered lost. How can you have a prevailing side when the vote was 78 to 78?"

Speaker Redmond: "Because the Chair ruled that it was adopted. And the Chair was in error. And the Chair wants to get the record straight."



And if it isn't straightened out this way, it will be straightened out some other way. This is the simple way to do it. I . . . the Clerk advised me it was 79-78, and that was in error. And on the basis of that, I declared that it had been adopted when in point of fact it had not."

Ewing: "Wouldn't it be simpler, Mr. Speaker, just to declare that it had lost?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. No, no. We have taken this up with the Parliamentarian and this is the recommended procedure. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which the Amendment was adopted . . . adopted. Those in favor say 'aye' . . . we need a Roll Call . . . those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. A simple majority required. On this question there's 103 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Gentleman's motion carries. And the vote by which it was adopted is reconsidered. Now, do you want to leave it on Second Reading for the present time? Okay, we'll leave it on Second Reading then. 251, Representative Deuster."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 251, a Bill for an Act to create the Death Penalty and establish procedures therefore. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Deuster, amends House Bill 251 on page 1, line 1, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster. Is Representative Deuster on the floor? Whose Amendment is this? Take it out of the record. 255."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 255, Kosinski, a Bill for an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I again see unauthorized people on the floor of the House. And you've been doing a hell of a job about this this Session; but I see some here. And I know you want to clear them off the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's point is well taken. All unauthorized



persons leave the floor. We will ask one of the Doorkeepers, that's brightly arrayed; to escort you off if you don't leave. Is my message getting through? Unauthorized people leave the floor. Representative Matijevich, do you care to identify someone?"

Matijevich: "Van Duyn's got a crowd over there. I don't know who they are."

Speaker Redmond: "Doorkeeper, we've got a gathering from Will County down there. Anybody else that doesn't belong on the floor? 255. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 256."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 256, Telcser, a Bill for an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. 256 . . . Second Reading of the Bill. There's an Amendment just filed that isn't printed yet. Is the Amendment just filed not printed yet?"

Speaker Redmond: "I understand an Amendment has been filed and not printed. Who's the Sponsor of that Amendment? We'll have to take it out of the record then. 277."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 277, John Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with sales of credit and the lending of money. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 277 on page 3 by deleting lines 22 and 23 and so forth. John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn. John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd be happy to answer any questions. At this time I would offer this Amendment for adoption. It was placed on as a Committee Amendment. And this Bill as amended passed out of Committee unanimously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Will the Sponsor explain the Amendment, please?"

Dunn, J.: "Yes, yes, I'd be happy to explain the Amendment. The Bill as drawn in Section 2(a) . . . let me find it in the Bill . . . as originally drawn the Bill in Section 2(a) provides that the maximum lawful rate of interest for written contracts secured by residential real estate shall be and thereafter follows the language that was





added by the General Assembly last year providing that the interest rate shall be 2½ percent above the index of U.S. Long-term Government Bonds. The language was considered to be a little bit confusing insofar as there was considerable concern that it might affect something other than agreements for deeds. So the proposed language in the Amendment is added to limit this Bill to providing that in addition to what we did last year, the new interest rate ceiling will apply to written contracts, agreements for deeds, or agreements for bonds for deed, providing for installment purchase of residential real estate. And it is the sole intent and purpose of this legislation to close an existing gap in our law in this regard."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Waddell: "In the language that you have in that Bill, does it provide anywhere in there that you can change the interest rate after the contact has been consummated?"

Dunn, J.: "No."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that this Amendment be adopted at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 279."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 279, Cunningham, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 279 on page 2 by deleting line 20 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham on the floor? Take it out of the record. 287."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 287, Sharp, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No



Committee Amendments. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 301."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 301, Van Duyne, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 301 on page 2, line 21, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne on Amendment #1."

Van Duyne: "I beg your indulgence for just a second . . . could you just postpone this a minute, Mr. Speaker, until I get ready?"

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 327."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 327, Simms, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to township organization. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 327 on page 1, lines 11 and 22, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms. Please give the Gentleman order. Representative Simms. Will you please sit down between the Chair and Representative Simms?"

Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Committee Amendment #1 strikes from '200,000' and reduces down to '100,000' the population required on a township. And I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 330."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 330, Schlickman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning fees and salaries. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 342."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 342, Leinenweber, a Bill for an Act to repeal



the Fair Trade Act as amended and repeal Sections of the Illinois Anti-Trust Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative . . . any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 351."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 351, DiPrima, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to regulate the granting of assistance to indigent war veterans and their families. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 40."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 40, Griesheimer. . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer, 40."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to establish a Military Naval Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 40 on page 1, line 20, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This particular Bill was amended in Committee. Representative Kent suggested that in the Bill itself there had not been a provision for the term of the Assistant . . . there had not been a term specified for the Assistant Adjutant General for Air, which this Bill creates. And what we did was amend it so that the term of the Assistant Adjutant General for Air would coincide with the Adjutant General and the Assistant Adjutant General for the Army. It does nothing but clarify the terms in it. I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion in the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "131."

Clerk O'Brien: "Third Reading."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Huskey, 131."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 131, Huskey, a Bill for an Act to repeal, add and amend Sections of the Vote Registration Safety Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 131 on page 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "I . . . I have no Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of this Amendment, Mr. Clerk? Your name is evidently on an Amendment, Representative . . ."

Clerk O'Brien: "It was offered by Representative . . ."

Wall: "Representative Huskey . . . yeah . . . it's your Bill."

Huskey: ". . . I lost my voice."

Wall: "This is Representative Huskey's. He lost his voice and he can't talk. But this is his Amendment, and he moves the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions?"

Wall: "All it does . . . all it does is . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Wall: ". . . it puts in an effective date, that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 27. Representative Ebbesen. House Bill 54, Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 54, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Compensation and Occupational Disease Insurance for rejected employers. Third Reading of the Bill. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 54 cleans up the language relative to the Workman's Compensation Act, and provides that if a person has been put into a risk pool that after being taken out of the risk pool by a carrier, a voluntary assignment by a carrier that he could then indulge in self-assurance and so forth. And all it does is, as I say, clean up the language."



Amendment #1 was added by Representative Schuneman to take care of some problems with self-insurers. And it came out of Committee erroneously. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 133. Representative Klosak on the floor? Out of the record. 182. Out of the record. 276. Representative Holewinski, 276."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 276, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 276 embodies the recommendation of the Special House Subcommittee on race track messenger services. The Subcommittee adopted its report, which has been distributed; and embodied in that report was the recommendation that a loophole in the gambling statutes be plugged so as to prohibit the operation of betting messenger services. For those of you who are not familiar with them, the way the services work, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, may I have . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: ". . . may I have some order, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Holewinski: "For those of you who are not familiar with the way the messenger services work, basically a person goes into one of the services, places a wager, and pay a commission on that wager. The messenger service then carries the wager out to the race track and places it, returning money in most cases, or when there are winnings at least. The options before the Subcommittee were really too full. And that was whether we should regulate or whether we should prohibit these operations. The Subcommittee after hearing an extensive amount of testimony recommended unanimously that we prohibit the operation of these services. Basically, the reasons . . ."



Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please. Break up the conference in the aisle there. We've got five conferences."

Holewinski: ". . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . . basically the reasons and the testimony we heard indicated that a large number of these messenger services were really illegal bookies, that large amounts of money received at the services never shows up at the track. And that was testimony that we received, not only from the racing officials and police officials, but admissions from messenger services themselves. We found that the industry was an extremely transient industry and there are a lot of businesses that open and close and really leave the consumer holding the bag. And that, you know, it's his money or her money that's never returned. We heard in considering whether to regulate or not are the extraordinary law enforcement problems that would be involved. For example, in Cook County there are 125 approximately different police departments and only two are large enough to have the kind of details that could monitor this type of activity. And it was thought that this would be an extremely expensive . . . expensive operation to regulate. The racing board estimated that it would cost them \$4,000,000 a year to set up a regulatory mechanism. All of this expenditure of more money while the affect of these businesses was to produce a decline in state revenues and a decline in attendance and wagering at race tracks. I'd be happy to answer any questions and would ask for your favorable support."

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

Sevcik: "Representative Holewinski, I understand that your Subcommittee met around January 13th, is that correct?"

Holewinski: "That is correct."

Sevcik: "Do you know that your Subcommittee was illegally constituted by meeting on that date?"

Holewinski: "It was reconstituted by Resolution passed in this current General Assembly, Representative."

Sevcik: "On what date was that Resolution passed?"

Holewinski: "I don't have that in front of me at this time. It was passed in the Eightieth General Assembly, though."



Sevcik: "It was passed in the Eightieth General Assembly?"

Holewinski: "That's correct."

Sevcik: "Well, I'd like to . . . I'd like to speak against this, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Sevcik: "We have a Resolution that was introduced in the Senate by Senator Howard Mohr and several other Senators for the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission to investigate messenger services. Our report will be out next week. We have the Bill prepared to introduce, and I say that we should withhold voting on this Bill until our report has been presented to the General Assembly. And I still maintain that the Subcommittee that met was illegally constituted because they were from Judiciary . . . from the Committee of Judiciary I or II from the last General Assembly. So I ask for a 'no' vote on this vote . . . Bill, or that this Bill be postponed until our report comes out next week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in response the . . . I've just been handed a copy of the Resolution. It was House Resolution #7, passed on January 12th of this year, making the . . . reconstituting the Subcommittee. And it's very clear that the Subcommittee operated with legal authority. I'm not clear as to whether the recommendations of the Senate Committee are any different than those contained herein; and I would suggest that we pass this over to the Senate and allow the Senate to work on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, under your Bill then this . . . the fact that we have gambling at the race tracks, that's legal, but it would be a gambling offense if we were to have licensing and supervision of any of these messenger services under the State of Illinois, is that right?"

Holewinski: "It would prohibit the carrying of a wager to a track for a fee, is what exactly what the Bill does. It does not really close the



door . . . the second part of our Subcommittee's recommendation was that the Revenue Committee discuss the feasibility of an off-track wagering system, which is different than these messenger betting services. That is the Resolution now pending before the Executive Committee. It's not . . ."

Geo-Karis: "But actually what your messenger betting service is is the kind of . . . it seems kind of a service, is it not; that a bookie is operating now?"

Holewinski: "Well, conceptually, yeah, very similar, yes very similar."

Geo-Karis: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "I feel that Representative Sevcik's idea is an excellent one. I think if we're going to do anything, we should try and get revenue for the State of Illinois. We're not going to get any revenue if we just outlaw these messenger services. And I think the feasibility of licensing and supervising these messenger services because people are going to gamble whether we like it or not and find their messenger places. I think they should come under strict supervision of the state or in local government for which they're located for the revenue that they can produce. And there's many cases of these operations where people lose money because they deal with unscrupulous people on the other end. And I do recommend that this Bill be lost and that the suggestion of Representative Sevcik that the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission investigate it further before we take action be considered."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, has a notice been sent out for the meeting that's on the aisle here? Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, on a point of information. I had an Amendment to this Bill . . . I see the Bill is on Third Reading. So in keeping with the spirit of the debate, I would like to go on record as tabling that Amendment, Amendment #3, to House Bill 276."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The Amendment hasn't been offered so there's no need to table it. . . . question of the . . ."

Huff: "I see. Well . . . Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, may I pose a few





questions to the Sponsor then?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski, this Gentleman desires to interrogate."

Huff: "Mr. Holewinski, and I was also in Judiciary I where we heard the debate on this subject. And it was brought out that the track had lost revenues because of the operations of this new phenomena of the track messenger service. I think the figure that you stated that the track has lost something like 35 percent of its patrons, and let me ask you this. Do you know what the total revenue to the state from paramutual racing was for the '75-'76 period?"

Holewinski: "I can only . . . from recollection give you a ballpark figure. I think it was somewhere around \$60,000,000."

Huff: "Do you know what the Racing Board estimate revenues were prior to the beginning of the '75-'76 racing period?"

Holewinski: "No, I do not."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the question of the loss of 35 percent of the patrons at the race track puzzle us all in the beginning until you realize that in 1975-'76 there was something like 3,901,000 patrons attending the Illinois Harness Racing Track over a course of 598 programs. And the combined revenues to the state from the flat and track sports came to something like \$76,000,000, which was \$10,000,000 over this . . . income of the Racing Board. And with regard to the mysterious 35 percent loss in patronage, I submit. . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Another meeting over here, I think it's unauthorized on the floor here. Please give the Gentleman order."

Huff: ". . . I submit that based on . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring the meeting to a close on the aisle here."

Huff: ". . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . . I submit only 3,000,000 people that came to the track if 35 percent were loss, we're talking about \$150,000 people who were patronizing the messenger track service. And the reason I suspect that they're doing this is because any of you who



are familiar with racing in the counties where it exists you realize it costs something like \$7 to \$8 just to get into the track before you can make a bet. So many of the people because of the inclement weather perhaps elected to use the messenger service. And I submit because of the messenger service no revenue, I repeat, no revenues were lost to the state. In fact, the state had an increase of revenue of \$10,000,000 based on this fact. I think this is a bad Bill. I believe that it has as much reality to life as the yellow brick road in 'munchkinland'. And I would urge you to vote against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I had the opportunity of serving on the Subcommittee of which the Gentleman from Cook and Sponsor of this Bill was Chairman. I served on some other Subcommittees, Committees and Commissions, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and I can assure you that this Subcommittee operated in a very, very deliberative and proper manner. And I point out to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this Subcommittee held full hearings in the City of Chicago. In attendance were every representative of a messenger service that was interested. Also in attendance, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, was a representative of the Illinois Bureau of Investigation, a representative of the Chicago Police Department and Bernard 'Carey', the States Attorney of Cook County. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in response to questions, the messenger service representatives could provide no record with respect to their activities, either because they don't keep records or they don't want those records exposed to the light of inquiry. With respect to the testimony of the representatives of law enforcement, local, state and county, it was amply evident, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there are illegal bookmaking operations in process by these messenger services and that they are not, these messenger services are not susceptible to regulation. For one, the cost would be prohibitive. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to show you the effect of messenger services, let me just quote from today's Chicago Tribune in an article by 'Dave Condent'. And he quotes, 'Charles Stormy Bidwell', President of Sportsman's Park',



Bidwell says, 'We had a good spring meeting in 1976. Arlington Park followed and did well until the messenger services began to mushroom. When they finally were about 130 messenger betting services in Chicago, Arlington's handle began to plunge. Maybe some of them do place every bet through the track windows and operate solely on the 10 percent fee they charge. I'm convinced, however', said Bidwell, 'that many of the operations are giving the tracks only the bets that they can't chance getting stuck with. I don't know how much money is handled by the messenger services; but I guarantee that every bit of it . . . that if every bit of it was bet legally the tracks wouldn't be in trouble. We're in trouble now. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have no brief for the race tracks in this state; but I do have a brief for the revenue that the track produced to the state. And that revenue is down because of these messenger betting services. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we want to maintain a good house, generally speaking, we want to maintain the revenue of this state. And, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that the approach is to pass this Bill to prohibit messenger services because they're not susceptible to regulation, they're not in the best interest of this state; and then following the passage of this Bill to give thoughtful consideration to establishing an off-track betting system in Illinois that has existed in other parts of this country and has proved to be effective, both in terms of revenue and law enforcement. So on these bases, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that I join with the Gentleman from Cook and respectfully solicit your support, your 'aye' vote for House Bill 276."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question or two? Representative Holewinski, how many complaints did the law enforcement people that testified before your Subcommittee and before the Judiciary Committee . . . how many complaints were actually filed with these law enforcement agencies based upon race track messenger services?"

Holewinski: "We had . . . the law . . . various law enforcement bodies



told us 20 to 40. The part . . . part of the problem was not really knowing the size of the . . . in the number of complaints is that there's no . . . since there's nobody in charge of this industry, there is really no clear-cut direction as to who you should complain to. So most patrons, our belief is who were ripped off, either failed to complain or called and made an inquiry of the Racing Board and were told that the Racing Board didn't handle it. And, therefore, just dropped it."

Leinenweber: "Well, how do you know that these people had complaints if they didn't register them?"

Holewinski: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Leinenweber: "How do you know that these people had complaints and were ripped off if they didn't register them?"

Holewinski: "The Racing Board reported to us that for a period of time when this . . . when these things were becoming built up they were getting a considerable number of calls, but not keeping any record of those calls since they felt they didn't have any jurisdiction over the subject matter."

Leinenweber: "All right, was any consideration or, excuse me, how much money did you say the Racing Board testified it would cost to effectively regulate these messenger services?"

Holewinski: "The Racing Board felt that if it were to use similar security arrangements to which it uses at the race tracks themselves would cost somewhere around \$4,000,000."

Leinenweber: "And that is to regulate the existing number or any future agencies, is that right, and services?"

Holewinski: "Would you repeat that, please? It's kind of noisy."

Leinenweber: "Well, let me . . . let me ask this question. Was any consideration given to getting a control on the number and location of messenger services?"

Holewinski: "The fundamental question that we considered was whether . . . whether it should be our policy to regulate or prohibit and weighing the evidence came down heavily on the side of prohibiting their operation, rather than any limitations on numbers and the scope of any regulations."



Leinenweber: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill if I might. House Bill 276 is similar to taking a howitzer to kill an ant, it is throwing the baby out with the bath water, it is an attempt to throw up our hands at an existing problem and saying, 'It can't be resolved so let's make it illegal'. Messenger services provide a method for increasing the number of people who will wager on horses in the State of Illinois. If the State of Illinois is going to be in the posture of legalizing this type of gambling, I do not see why that we should inhibit this growth in this man . . . in this method. There have been very few complaints basically because I believe there are very few people complaining. This state has known bookies for the entire time that we've had racing in the State of Illinois and elsewhere. They're going to continue to have bookies. And people do not have complaints with the bookies because they run a particular type of business that you live up to your word. The type of service that we're talking about will hurt the bookies a heck of a lot more than it'll hurt the race track because it'll open up gam . . . race track gambling to a large number of people that do not have time to go to the track. There are ways that could . . . that we could very easily regulate this type of service the same as we do tracks, by limiting the number, by requiring a certificate of need, by limiting . . . limiting the location to areas that can be covered by the Racing Board. I do not see any reason in the world why we should make it illegal in this method. So I urge a 'no' vote on House Bill 276."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, with the volume of work we have on . . . on Amendments to our rules, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Holewinski to close."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an extremely complex issue because it's a complex industry. I might tell you that this industry is unknown in any other part of



the United States. In two states, Louisiana and Kentucky, when messenger services developed the . . . their Legislatures acted quickly to prohibit their operation. In Kentucky the Governor called a Special Session to deal with the problem. Illinois has had less than a sterling history with regards to its racing industry. Every law enforcement official that testified, the Racing Board, the tracks themselves, the testimony was unanimous that these things are to the detriment of the racing industry in Illinois. It's quality, service to patrons and the encouragement of a quality sport. I think further you have to take it . . . especially if you're from Chicago, you have to take a look at the affect these operations have on our neighborhoods. Our neighborhood strip shopping areas are now no longer shopping areas; but they're just a row of taverns, bookies, porno' book stores. I think that there's no effective way of dealing with this problem in terms of regulation. We have suggested that we consider an off-track wagering system, and that was a realistic proposal. I solicit your favorable support for House Bill 276."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'no' vote, which may be a little unusual, I used to be one to express myself strongly against gambling of any kind. And I voted against the lottery. But I think we're in an unusual position now where we have the State of Illinois operating the lottery, people in my district and all over the state are going into the corner grocery store, the liquor store, all over our communities, they're buying lottery tickets. They're engaging in gambling. Now if you voted in favor of this Bill to ban and abolish the messenger service, what you're telling your constituents is if instead of buying lottery tickets, they prefer to bet on the horses. But they've got to take a day off of work, go to the track, and to spend a whole day gambling, instead of maybe just placing one bet. I have constituents in Lake County who contacted me to say, 'What's wrong if a neighbor of their's go in to buy a lottery ticket, why can't they go place a bet through



a messenger service?' And I think that besides that that this Bill is premature. We should give more careful thought to the alternatives which are licensing, regulating and taxing this activity. And finally I say if the State of Illinois as a government, as our state government, is engaged in running a gambling operation, why should we tell private enterprise that they can't do a little of it too? And I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. For those of you who aren't sure if there's a fiscal impact, let me give you some figures. On the average the state receives 7 3/4 percent of each dollar that's wagered. The Racing Board has gone on record stating that the wagering at the harness and thoroughbred race tracks in Chicago has declined \$100,000 to \$200,000 a day since the establishment of the off-track betting parlors, rather the messenger service parlors. This means that the state is losing between \$15,000 to \$30,000 every day which it was receiving prior to the inception of messenger services. This means that within the last 12 months the state has lost just under \$2,000,000 in revenue ~~that~~ it would have received had messenger services not been in existence. We heard from the states attorneys, the Chicago police and the I.B.I. that it was too costly to police this type of service. And that the time and money could better be spent on preventing hard crimes. At our Subcommittee hearings we invited 20 messenger services, only 4 of them responded. The others were obviously afraid. This has nothing to do with off-track betting, don't be dissuaded that it does. Thank you very much for your favorable Roll Call."

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

Sandquist: "I'd like to . . . I'd like to urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Although I do want to say that Representative Huff, and Representative Geo-Karis and Representative Deuster do exhibit something that we've got to consider. Because when you consider how many of these operations there are in the greater Chicago area people are going to be betting. And unless we do something as a follow-up to this . . . it . . . and getting the state to come in to control these, all we're doing is



driving people to the illegal bookies. So vote 'yes' on this; but don't forget we've got to follow-up to control this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "As I stated before, based on Holewinski's figures, the 35 percent loss patronages at the track, which represents something like 150 . . . 200,000 people, who are betting at the messenger service, I'm going to . . . I'm going to change my vote from 'present' to 'aye' just to give an object lesson. And the lesson is this, that that \$10,000,000 that we had in increased revenue will not see the light of day in the . . . in the F.Y. column of '77 because those people aren't going back to the tracks, they're not going to spend \$8 for parking and various other concessions just to get into the joint to make a \$2 bet when they can go to the neighborhood and bet three times as much. All we're going to do about passing this Bill is drive those betters to the bookies. So I'm going to vote 'aye' on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I think Representative Huff may very well be right. Yesterday I attempted to get the first tax out of the Revenue Committee, and it failed 19 to 1. So I'm going to be able to drink my soda pop without it increasing one cent a can. But that also means that senior citizens are not going to get property tax relief this year. And I'm searching for extra revenue anywhere I can get it. And I think we can squeeze it out of these messenger services."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hate to take the time of the House, but apparently since this Bill is safely passed, I think it might be an opportunity to explain to my new colleague about the problem that I'm faced with on this Bill as I am in most Bills. I have a conflict of interest in this particular legislation. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any Bill that I will vote on in the next two years in which I do not have a conflict of interest. If I breathe, I think I'd have a problem voting





on hospital Bills. If I'd like to place a bet, I think I'd have a problem voting . . . a conflict of interest on voting on a Bill like on this. If I vote on a pay raise, or per diem I have a conflict of interest. I go into detail for the new Members only because I don't intend to bore you in the future; but I want you to understand when I get up and simply state for the record that I have a conflict of interest, I do so. And will simply vote my conscience. I allow my constituents and those of the people of the state to determine whether I'm voting on my self-interest or not. To suggest that I should be prohibited from voting because of a conflict of interest would mean that there would be no votes cast in this House on any issue. I thank you for your patience and I hope you will bear with me in the future when I come with a simple statement, I have a conflict of interest."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and 9 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 283."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 283, Anderson, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson on the floor? Take it out of the record. 2 . . . 317."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 317, Ewing, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is a rather simple Bill, an Amendment to the Probate Act, which provides procedure whereby people can designate who they would like to serve as their conservator if and when they are ever adjudicated incompetent. It also provides where there is a written instrument of agency which would be a power of attorney that that principle shall be deemed competent for purposes that agency until he is adjudicated incompetent. Many times people designate a power of attorney so that somebody can act for them if they are incompetent. But under our statute it's not perfectly clear that that agency is



valid until those persons are declared incompetent. This merely codifies the law as it presently is. And I would ask for a favorable vote. It was passed out of Judiciary Committee on an overwhelming majority."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Laurino 'aye'. You'd better push your switch, Sir. It's impossible to . . . pretty nearly impossible to add you once we've taken the record. The Clerk will take the record. Laurino, did you vote? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 321, D. L. Houlihan! Out of the record. Introduction, First Reading. Representative Ryan on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 615, Ryan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 616, Ryan, a Bill for an Act to amend the Physicians' Assistance Practice Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to suspend Rule 31(b) to advance to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee House Bills 615 and 616."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Could we ask him to hold that motion, please, until the Majority Leader returns to the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Would you hold the motion until Representative Madigan returns? Do you desire to be . . . will you hold the motion?"

Ryan: "Yes, certainly."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you desire to be recognized for the purpose of some excused absences? The Republican . . ."

Ryan: ". . . the Clerk has my list . . . Mr. Speaker, I think it's Representative McAvoy, Representative Anderson because of illness, Representative . . ."



Speaker Redmond: "McMaster's official business."

Ryan: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Hoffman because of family illness."

Ryan: "Family illness. And McAvoy and Anderson because of personal illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections to the record showing that their absences are excused? Hearing none, the record will so show. Representative Hanahan, do you have an announcement?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "How long . . . I hold my motion, but I certainly want to hear . . . I would like to have called . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "It will be heard . . . it will be called."

Ryan: ". . . Thank you. Representative Hanahan, a very important announcement."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the tickets for the St. Patrick and St. Joseph's Day dinner that will be held March 22nd have now arrived to the Committee. There will be a meeting of the Committee starting with Representative George Ryan, who is the Co-chairman, Representative Redmond, Madigan, Bradley, Walsh, Jim Houlihan, Dave McAvoy, Ed McBroom, Virginia Macdonald, William Laurino, Ralph Capparelli, DiPrima, Lechowicz, Kozubowski, Daniels, Peters, Petrovich, Kucharski, Conti, Rigney, Stearney, Matejek and Domico. This meeting will take place immediately upon adjournment in the Speaker's office. The tickets will be \$15. And each of the Committee Members will be asked to handle a specific amount of tickets with other Legislators. I urge every Member to participate. It is their Welfare Committee. The proceeds are used for the welfare of the Members of the House of Representatives. So the tickets will be available, probably distributed tomorrow and hopefully the returns next week. So bring your checkbooks down next week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney, for what purpose do you arise?"

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering, I have a motion on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "It wasn't my intention to go to that quite yet. On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 94. Representative Katz.



94, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. The Amendments have not yet been distributed. They are in the process of being collated. Will be distributed very shortly. But they are not yet back from the Clerk as I understand it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The order of Motions. House Bill 286, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a motion to discharge the House Judiciary II Committee of which I'm the Minority Spokesman. Reluctantly, I make this motion after the Vice-Chairman of that very same Committee had to arrive last week to discharge Committee. This Bill is House Bill 286, which would provide criminal penalties for anyone who creates, sells or distributes pornography, child pornography, which involves young children under the age of 14 engaged in sexual, deviate sexual and homosexual acts. Now, I think this Bill is a much-needed measure to solve a serious social problem. In Committee last week it failed by one vote. It only received 11 'yes', 2 'no' votes and 5 'present' votes. Now, I must remind the Members of this House that there was no specific constitutional objection to this Bill. Under Representative Lechowicz's questioning, Representative of the A.C.L.U., was failed . . . failed to point out any specific objection. Mr. Lechowicz asked them on five different occasions if there was anything specifically wrong. And the answer was that he could not say. So I say to you at this time I ask for a favorable Roll Call to discharge the Committee on House Bill 286. And if we do so at this time, this Bill can pass and we can prohibit the sale and dissemination of child pornography. And I know that many of the Gentlemen of the House have seen the actual evidence. And this Bill serves no justification for having it on the streets. I know that after seeing this evidence it shocks the conscience of many of the people in the House, and know that this material is readily available right here in Springfield. And just last week, I may say to you Ladies and Gentlemen, that I was able to obtain a film of young people, kids 10 years old, involved in deviate and homosexual acts. This material being readily available



right here in the Capital of the State of Illinois. For that reason, I ask you to give me a favorable Roll Call, to give me 89 votes to discharge the Committee on Judiciary II. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann. There'll be no demonstrations.

We will clear the gallery if there are any more demonstrations. This is a deliberative legislative Body. Representative Mann."

Mann: "I guess they were clapping . . . clapping as I got up, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Understandable. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for some order here."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to give you a little history leading up to my position here. But first I want to tell you that no one finds more distasteful in sex the using of children as posers and reproducers in sexual acts, both with children and adults. But how we write that Bill and whether we come up with egg on our face is another story. Now, the Subcommittee which I was appointed to, and I want you to listen to this history, please, that Subcommittee was appointed last August because the obscenity - laws of the State of Illinois had been declared unconstitutional. I was appointed as a Chairman of the Subcommittee on Obscenity. And we met three times. In December the news of the pornography material involving explicit children acts came to our notice. We were already to write a statute. So we held a hearing. And the same people that showed up at Mr. Stearney's hearing down here showed up on February 14th. He introduced his Bill on February 10th. On February 9th we sent out the notice. Now, the unusual thing about this is Representative Stearney is a Member of the Subcommittee. Now, I address myself to Chairmen, Subcommittee Chairmen, Leaders, Members of the House, if we have a situation that obtains in which a Member of a Subcommittee can introduce a Bill before the Subcommittee has considered everything, we will have chaos. Therefore, I'm asking you to permit the Subcommittee to work. I want you to understand, though, this was not a Subcommittee on a particular Bill. This was a Subcommittee on an area. Now really, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, you know we can't have Members of Subcommittees



running away with Bills before the Subcommittee itself makes this deliberation. Therefore, I would like you, and request you, if you don't want to see the Committee system ruined down here I would urge that you not grant this motion so that we can have a reliable Subcommittee system. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am a Member of the Subcommittee of Judiciary II. It was formed to study the whole question of obscenity. We discussed this in Committee last week. As a Member of this Subcommittee, I guess I resent this idea of jumping ahead of the Subcommittee's recommendations. We have not met for our final meeting. I think this is premature. We . . . other Legislators are drafting a Bill that will have even stricter sanctions for this particularly hedious act. And I really believe that we should wait until the Subcommittee drafts its final report, studies all submitted legislation and then come to the Committee and then the floor. I would urge a 'no' vote on this. All of us are sickened by this child pornography. We want to draft a good Bill. We don't want to run ahead and then have it end up in a court and be back where we were right now. So I would urge a 'no' vote on discharging to the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would speak in favor of the motion. At the time the Bill was called for hearing, it was late in the day. The Committee had . . . we considered the Death Penalty Bills. And many of the Members had to leave for other reasons . . .for other meetings. I happen to be one. The Bill got 11 of the 13 people . . . 'aye' votes from the 13 people there. As I understand it, the failure of the . . . because of lateness of day it was the only reason this Bill was kept in Committee. So I think that at this particular instance this motion is proper."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed



'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me just make a few comments in rebuttal. The question is as to a Subcommittee. Rule 20 of the House Rules provide that a Subcommittee is to be created by a vote of the Committee. I say to you there is no standing legitimate Subcommittee on Obscenity in Judiciary II. I have here the transcript of the minutes . . . of the proceedings last Tuesday. Question to Mr. Katz by Mr. Leinenweber, 'My question is, has there been a duly appointed Subcommittee in the Eightieth General Assembly?'. The answer by Mr. Katz, 'No.'. Since that time there has not been a vote to create a Subcommittee. So, therefore, there is no Subcommittee, standing Subcommittee, in the House Judiciary . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania, for what purpose do you arise?"

Catania: "On a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Catania: "If Representative Stearney wants to read us the transcript, I hope he will continue and read the section where Representative Katz points out that as the Minority Spokesman on the Judiciary II Committee, Representative Stearney has failed to appoint any Republican Members to the Subcommittee on Obscenity, even after Representative Katz requested that he do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "I beg to differ with you, Representative. Republican Members have been appointed. But nevertheless, let me go on. What bothers me is that there is no justification for me to go to anyone before introducing a Bill in this Assembly. No one has to go to the Speaker and seek his permission to introduce a Bill. I do not have to go to the Minority Leader, George Ryan, to ask him if I can introduce a Bill. And I'm certainly not going to go on bended knee to a Chairman on Subcommittee or . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "A point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Matijevich: "The manner of introduction . . . introducing legislation has



nothing to do with your motion."

Speaker Redmond: "You're absolutely correct. Confine your remarks to the motion."

Stearney: ". . . I say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you've heard the debate; but nevertheless no one has stated any specific objections to this Bill. Not one person has got up and said that on page 2, lines 15 and 16, this is the problem of the Bill. There is no objection; there being no objection, I ask for a favorable Roll Call, I mean, vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Before this vote is taken, I want to remind the gallery that there will be no demonstrations. And if there is, that that is violated, we will clear the gallery. The question is on the Gentleman's . . . Representative Mann. Representative Mann. I don't know what he's rising for. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, just a technical point, Mr. Speaker. The merits of the Bill are not before the House."

Speaker Redmond: "That is . . . that is correct. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to discharge the Committee. It's on that motion, And it requires 89 votes to suspend the rules. And the question's on the Gentleman's motion to suspend the rules. It takes 89 affirmative votes. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you arise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in favor of the motion because I do not think that we should've let political boondoggling affect the lives of young children. I think this is a good Bill. And forget about party politics, we should think of the children first. And I urge a favorable consideration of the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Meyer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that Chairman Katz thinks that this is a personal affront to him; but this Bill got 127 votes. And I think no . . . no Committee in the history of the General Assembly, certainly since I've been here since 1966, has been so consistently wrong. This is the second time that they've been wrong this year."





I'm sure they'll be wrong many more times."

Speaker Redmond: "We have advised the Members once we take the record, it's virtually impossible to get on the Roll Call. Evidently some people have not gotten on this Roll Call. So I'm going to instruct the Clerk to dump this Roll Call. And, again, advise you that you must get on the Roll Call. Dump the Roll Call. And those in favor of the Gentleman's motion will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no'. Representative Katz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Katz: "My name was mentioned in debate by the Gentleman from Chicago. He said something about my being personally affronted. That is not the case at all. I do object to the Member from Chicago who gets up and presumes to pass judgment on 23 of his colleagues who worked very hard in the Judiciary II Committee. If the Gentleman desires to be on the Judiciary II Committee, he should join the Judiciary II Committee. The Members all worked very hard. They do the best they can. If other Members on the floor do not feel that their judgment is correct, they have every right under the rules to discharge the Committee. But the Gentleman is entirely wrong in suggesting any personal affront; but I do not like him slaughtering 23 people who worked pretty hard on that Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 25 'no'; the Gentleman's motion prevails, and the rule is suspended. Will you please break up the meeting on the floor around the Minority Leader? House Bill . . . House Bills, Second Reading, House Bill 256. Will you break up the meeting along the Minority Leader's desk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 256, Telcser, a Bill for an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 256 on page 2 by deleting lines 24 and 25 and inserting in lieu, thereof, 'becoming a law'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser. I can't see Representative Telcser. There's people standing between the Chair . . ."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Committee Amendment #1 simply changes the Bill to make it effective upon becoming law . . ."



Speaker Redmond: ". . . Representative Schlickman, I can't see Representative Telcser."

Telcser: ". . . I now move that Amendment #1 to House Bill 256 be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Madigan, amends House Bill 256 on page 2, line 18, be deleting and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Madigan is here, and I've sighted the aisle where he's been spending quite a bit of time."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is Representative Madigan? Will you identify yourself?"

Telcser: "Right on Ryan's desk."

Speaker Redmond: "There he is. Representative Ryan's . . ."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I've discussed my Amendment with several Members on the Democratic side, and it's the consensus that we'd like to add some additional language to the Amendment before it's offered. Therefore, I would ask Representative Telcser if he would hold this Bill until we have an opportunity to amend the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Is that satisfactory, Representative Telcser? Out of the record. I understand that the Amendment for House Bill 10, is that ready now? Representative Madigan . . . or Madison. Is your Amendment on House Bill 10 . . ."

Madison: "Is it ready?"

Speaker Redmond: ". . . On House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 10. Do you have an Amendment, Mr. Clerk? Amendment 5, would it be? Rep . . . On House Bills, Third Reading. Representative Kosinski requests leave to return House Bill 10 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 10 on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Madison, amends House Bill 10 on page 1 by deleting lines 1 and 2 and inserting in lieu, thereof, the following and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 to House Bill 10, this Amendment . . . well, first of all, let me say this, Mr. Speaker, I guess its' been . . . made evident by most of you that I am personally opposed to the death penalty. It also appears to me that . . . that just based on the fervor of the House at this point that the Death Penalty Bill in some form is going to fly out of here. And so my reaction to that is Amendment #6, Mr. Speaker, which simply provides that where the death penalty has been imposed that the execution of the defendant will be witnessed by six Members of the General Assembly. And I solicit your favorable Roll Call for Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski on the Amendment. Representative Kosinski, do you desire to be recognized?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the death penalty to me is a very serious affair. Now, I've agreed with Mr. Madison to move this Bill back to Second Reading to consider this Amendment. But that Amendment attempts to make the death . . . the execution of someone the specific arena of the General Assembly. I think the Amendment is dilatory. I can understand the Amendment when Mr. Madison indicates that he's against the death penalty and philosophy. At the same time, I cannot accept such an Amendment. The decision as to who is . . . who are witnesses is dependent upon the Department of Corrections. This is not a Roman arena. This is not the private domain of the General Assembly. I object most strenuously to this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is Representative Meyer on the floor? I would like to ask him if he would rather serve on this Committee or Judiciary II."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "How can I follow that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the last words of the speaker. This is not a Roman arena, where



they fed Christians to the lions. We're talking about the life of human beings, that's what we're talking about. And all this Amendment says is that since we are rushing the death penalty through, since the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court has not passed on the death penalty on this state, the Supreme Court that we were pleading another court to try . . . death penalty . . . we had no right to do it. Since we are rushing it through, I think that at least we ought to agree that some Members of this House, who are so determined, so determined, to take a human life, who don't believe that a mistake can be made, ought to at least agree to witness the taking of a human life. Maybe this will have changed their attitude. Oh, I know that some of them think that the minute you do this crime is going to cease. Well, you ask the people in the State of Wisconsin and these other states whether or not crime is going to cease. Ask the people in the state where they instituted a death penalty whether crime ceased. It's not going to cease whether we have the death penalty or not. And I think we ought to adopt this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison to close."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, pardon me, Representative Friedrich, do you seek recognition?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I served on the Committee to visit prisons for 10 years, and I think I've probably seen as many men on death row as anyone in this House. Because of that, I reviewed the cases and the incidents which brought them to the death sentence. So I'm not talking about something I don't know a little bit about. But it seems to me that if the courts have ruled that we can't appoint members to election boards because it violates the separation of powers, then we can't sit here in a judiciary capacity to rule on who's put to death or not. I think that's pretty elementary. And I think . . . I have no reason to believe the courts would rule that we have the right to decide who's put to death."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree with Representative Madison and I agree with Representative Davis



that we're all concerned about a 'respect for life'. And I would suggest to the Sponsor of this Amendment and to the other opponents of the death penalty that if they would be inclined to take six Members of the General Assembly to visit with the families of the victims of police killers and multiple murders then I might be inclined to support this Amendment. In short of that particular commitment, I think that this Amendment is dilatory and only inclined to make a mockery of the Bill, which I think is a well-drafted Bill and serves a real problem and hits a real need."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I was wondering if the Gentleman would yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Which Gentleman?"

Hanahan: "The Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Yes."

Hanahan: "Representative Madison, if it seems important to introduce this Amendment to witness an execution, I was wondering if you'd be willing to watch an abortion?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I have no response to that question."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems that when we talk about dignity of life that it seems very odd that the dignity of a human child that is yet to be born seems immaterial to some Members that want to sanctify life of a hardened criminal who heinously will commit a crime against his fellow, and brother and sister human being. It's odd that some of the people who are mostly against capital punishment for hardened criminals are those that want . . . that want to speak out so vocally to save a criminal, but to kill an unborn child. I think that if it's good to have witnesses to watch an execution of a criminal who's been adjudged by his fellow man as a guilty felon that we should also then when we vote on the abortion issues, we should also then assign Members of the General Assembly to watch each and every abortion that is committed in this state. As for me, I vote . . . I will be voting 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe, for what purpose do you arise?"

McAuliffe: "I rise to speak against this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McAuliffe: "I would invite some of the opponents to capital punishment to take a ride on a Saturday night in Chicago with the Chicago Police Department and have . . . we have a ride-along program. We'd be happy to take these people for a ride in some of the areas of Chicago to show 'em what happens, and get a firsthand view of what the victims of crime look like. See what a guy looks like that's laying on the sidewalk that's been shot in the belly with a sawed-off shotgun at about two feet. And you'd get an idea of what kind of violence is going on in the City of Chicago. Now, the death penalty would be one method of stopping a killer from doing it twice. And if you're so sympathetic to the offender, I suggest that you take a ride along in Chicago and see what happens to the victim. And get an idea of what it looks like to see a guy laying there with his stomach shot from a sawed-off shotgun and that might change your opinions. You might have a little more sympathy for the victims."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no' the 'ayes' have it. Representative Madison to close."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've listened very carefully to the comments regarding my Amendment about it being dilatory and other negative remarks regarding this Amendment. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to me that not one speaker who spoke against this Amendment has addressed the Amendment itself. It appears to me that those speakers have attempted to defend the Death Penalty Bill. My Amendment does not address itself to the question of whether or not there shall be a death penalty. The only comment that I made regarding the death penalty itself was that I was personally opposed to it. Now, I'm not asking you to justify your position on the death penalty, I'm simply saying that where the death penalty has been imposed that the execution should be witnessed by Members of this General Assembly



because it is us who are about to pass the Death Penalty Bill. It also provides for a waiver for those who are conscientious objectors. Now, Mr. Speaker, that seems to me to be very plain and clear. If you are for the death penalty, God bless you. If you are against the death penalty, God bless you. But at least we, those of us who have said we're going to pass this Bill, we ought to be willing to witness the execution of the defendant. And I would respectfully request your favorable support on Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #6. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 29 'aye' and 117 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. The Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On the Speaker's desk, House Resolution 94. For the information of the Members, there have been 39 Amendments filed. We have distributed a synopsis or an analyses of the first 15. When the others are ready . . . when the analyses on the others are ready we will distribute that. Representative Katz on House Resolution 94."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute . . . Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before we get into this could we go to motions and get my motion out of . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, surely. Incidentally, I guess I didn't move House Bill 10 to Third Reading, did I? Did I? Okay. On the Order of Motions, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move to suspend Rule 31(b) to advance to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee House Bills 615 and 616."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, these Bills failed with the Governor's proposal to



deal with the current crisis at the mental health hospitals regarding the limited licensed physicians. I have talked at length with Representative Ryan and a representative of the Governor's Office today; and we are attempting to develop a program which would accommodate the emergency crisis for the executive, but also provide for a great deal of input by this Body and possibly the Senate as far as monitoring further developments regarding the limited licensed physicians. I am not completely satisfied with the Governor's proposal at this time. However, I realize the emergency nature of the situation and the need for Representative Ryan's motion to put these Bills up on the Calendar without reference to Committee. And, therefore, I intend to support his motion."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, a twofold purpose. One, is that this isn't Third Reading, is it?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for Leader Ryan. Oh, I'm sorry, my Leader tells me the motion is not debatable. So I'll wait a couple of minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion . . . Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you arise? I can't see Representative Satterthwaite. Somebody is standing up between her and the Chair."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Bills have been distributed to the Membership. Here we are about to take action on Bills we don't even have copies of."

Speaker Redmond: "Just been introduced. This isn't action, I don't believe you'll have it tomorrow before you're expected to do anything with it. Representative Hart, do you seek recognition? I guess not. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I reluctantly rise to oppose the motion to take each Bill to Second Reading without reference to Committee. This is a crisis, that I agree. But it's a crisis that didn't arise overnight; and it's a problem that's





not going to be solved without some input from the public. I do not . . . I do not think that it's wise or responsible for this Body to agree to bypass Committee on these Bills. After all, it is not the health of the Governor or his program that's involved, but it's the health of the inmates and the people in the institutions. And I think that we ought to have some input as to the various solutions to the problem from members of the public. I wouldn't oppose the . . . having a hearing on the Bill as soon as possible. But I don't think we should bypass Committee. And I'm going to oppose the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mudd: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, too, have to oppose this motion. These . . . this isn't the first time that there's been a request to extend the provisions or restrictions as it relates to testing and qualifications for these physicians. So I think what we're . . . what Mr. Hart, Representative Hart and few others of us are interested in is that we have a hearing and that we'll try to resolve our problem instead of extending it. I don't think we should react in a time of crisis, we should resolve this thing once and for all. And I can't support the motion until it goes to Committee. And I'm not too sure even after it comes out that unless there's some real tight regulations and understanding between the Legislature and the Executive office that . . . will support them. But I . . . I do not support this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in our early days in the Session all I see us doing is discharging Committee and bypassing Committee. I think that . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Matijevich: ". . . I think the Leadership on both sides of the House ought to just recess right now and get their heads together and determine if we're going to be a deliberative Body. Here we have a Leader of the House telling us that we ought to bypass Committee. This is a very crucial matter that we're going to deliberate on. This is a matter that we've had a House Investigating Commission, a



Commission of which that Minority Leader was a Member, made a recommendation of which we passed certain legislation. And now we're going to counteract that Committee . . . Commission recommendation, that legislation and hurriedly go into something without Committee action. That's about as irresponsible a thing that we can do. And I suggest if we're going to go that route, Leaders get your heads together, get your act together and let's start being a deliberative Body. Otherwise, let's pack our bags and go home and save the taxpayers a lot of money."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Ryan to close."

Ryan: "Nondebatable motion, Mr. Speaker, I renew it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to discharge the Committee to suspend the rule of . . . Rule 31(b) and to advance these Bills to Second Reading without reference to Committee. It appears on Supplemental Calendar #1. It takes an affirmative vote of 107 Members. Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'aye', 25 'no'; the Gentleman's motion prevails. Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise?"

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A parliamentary inquiry. On the Bills that was under the previous motion that was advanced without reference, will those Bills remain and be moved to Second Reading, First Legislative Day or Second Legislative Day?"

Speaker Redmond: "Second Day."

Barnes, E.: "Will they remain there so that we will have allowed time to prepare . . . to prepare Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "They should appear . . . they should appear on the Calendar tomorrow."

Barnes, E.: "But will they remain there, Mr. Speaker? The question is, is whether or not they will remain there to allow the Membership time to prepare Amendments for them."

Speaker Redmond: "I see a hand seeking recognition; but I can't identify the hand. Representative Ryan."



Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make sure that we moved both . . . the motion included those two Bills, 615 and 616."

Speaker Redmond: "It included . . . the motion included House Bills 615 and 616."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion carried and it will be on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think Representative Barnes' question was answered. So I'll ask it again. Do we have a commitment from the Minority Leader that that . . . those two Bills will remain on Second Reading . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "They will be on Second Reading."

Madison: ". . . long enough, Mr. Speaker. Because the Bills were just introduced . . . they haven't even been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let me say this. They will be on Second Reading, and an adequate time will be given. You may know that as far as the Chair is concerned, I kind of frown at the idea of holding progress up on Bills by saying that I have a . . . an Amendment in preparation some place. And that a reasonable time on Second Reading, reasonable time to prepare Amendments is my intention. And I'm sure it's the intention of the Chair."

Madison: "Well, that's why I raised the question of the Minority Leader, Mr. Speaker. I wanted a commitment from him because he's the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I didn't hear the question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He wants to know whether you'll leave them there and not ask them to be moved without reasonable time to have Amendments prepared."

Ryan: "Well, I don't know how reasonable Representative Madison is. I don't know what he means by reasonable."

Speaker Redmond: "He's at least as reasonable as the Sponsor of these Bills."

Ryan: "Did he want to do that by lot?"

Madison: "Well, the question, Mr. Speaker, does not relate to my reasonableness, but the reasonableness of the Majority Leader . . . or the



Minority Leader."

Ryan: "Well, Representative Madison, they'll be read a second time tomorrow, and they'll be on the Calendar next Tuesday if we're coming in next Tuesday. And I think we are. I don't know how much time you want."

Madison: "It's not a question of how much time I want, Repre . . . Repre . . ."

Ryan: "Well, I'm not sure I understand your question then, Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, the question is, whether you would leave them on Second Reading to give us sufficient enough time to read the Bills and develop Amendments if we have any. I think you've answered the question. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question still goes to the same manner . . . matter that was being discussed by Representative Madison. We do not have the Bills. You can't read it, you can't see it. So there's no way you can prepare anything for it. So my question is, will these Bills remain until the Members have the

Speaker Redmond: "They will . . . they will."

Barnes, E.: ". . . documents so that you can read them. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Well, I was just going to extend the remarks of Representative Barnes because what is reasonable to one person may be unreasonable to another. I really think Bills this important ought to be able to . . . for each of us Members to at least have the availability of a staff analysis because I surely would like to see an Amendment to the Bills to make sure if we are going to go this route that there be some system of monitoring because we all know the . . . what happened with the 'Munoz' . . . 'Dr. Munoz' incident. We don't want any occurrences like that again. And I'd just like to see something more definitive as far as that time element's concerned."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart seeks recognition."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker, we would like to have a Democratic Conference immediately in Room 114. And we'd ask to have the House recess for that



purpose."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne, for what purpose do you arise?"

Van Duyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had previously asked you if we could go back to Second Reading for House . . . for an Amendment to House Bill 301. I don't think it'll take very long."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. It's the intention to have the House stand in Perfunctory Session for about five minutes after this motion in order to . . . for the introduction of Bills and if there's no serious objection, we'll go to House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 301, and Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Amendment . . ."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 301, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: ". . . Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment #1 is . . ."

Clerk O'Brien: "One Committee Amendment . . ."

Van Duyne: ". . . is a simple attempt to clarify the language and be a little bit more specific as to the jurisdiction and the duties of the people involved here. And rather than presumptuous . . . or be presumptuous and assume their duties in their jurisdiction we just spelled it out. It's a simple Amendment. And I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 301. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. We will . . . you've heard the Gentleman's motion for a recess. How long, Representative Hart?"

Hart: "30 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "30 minutes. Are there any objections to that? Representative Hart."

Hart: "The Conference will . . . the Democratic Conference will be held



immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Hart: "We will ask to have a 30-minute recess for that purpose in Room 114."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, in the meantime, the House . . . the House will stand in Perfunctory Session for the Introduction and First Reading of Bills. But we will stand in recess until 1 o'clock. Democratic Conference in Room 114. Will you please . . . Democrats please go to Room 114 promptly so we can be back here at 1 o'clock. It's the intention to try to address ourselves to the rules this afternoon. And we have some 39 Amendments. So we've got a full day's work ahead of us."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 617, Sandquist, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 618, Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to public water districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 619, Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 620, Flinn, a Bill for an Act to license, tax and regulate the business of operating Jai Alai exhibitions. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 621, E. G. Steele-Lucco, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 622, Jaffe, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 623, Byers-Holewinski, a Bill for an Act to require nursing homes, sheltered care homes and homes for the aged to train certain employees. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 624, Byers-Holewinski, a Bill for an Act in relation to the protection of the human rights to persons admitted to nursing homes. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 625, Byers-Holewinski, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes, Sheltered Care Homes and Homes for the Aged Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 626, Byers-Holewinski, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes, Sheltered Care Homes and Homes for the Aged Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 627, Byers-Holewinski, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes, Sheltered Care Homes and Homes



for the Aged Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 628, Byers-Holewinski . . . oh, that's Byers-Jim Houlihan, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 629, Mahar, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to establish a Military and Naval Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 630, Collins, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 631, Collins, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Policeman's Annuity and Benefit Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 632, Collins, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Fireman's Annuity and Benefit Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 633, Collins, a Bill for an Act to amend Chicago Fireman's Annuity and Benefit Fund Article. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 634, Laurino, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code and the Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 635, C. M. Stiehl, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Auditor General. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 636, Geo-Karis-Jaffe-Peters, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 637, Peters-Jaffe, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 638, Peters-Jaffe, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Police Training Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 639, Geo-Karis-Jaffe-Peters, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to sexually dangerous persons. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 640, Brummett, a Bill for an Act to require the Department of Corrections to provide food for certain state institutions. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 641, Ralph Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 642, Stearney, a Bill for an Act to repeal the Prosecutors Advisory Council Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 643, Mudd, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 644, Mudd, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Construction Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill. Committee Reports. Representative Pierce, Chairman from



the Committee on Revenue to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken March 8, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendations, 'do pass' House Bill 121, 'do not pass' House Bill 414. No further Perfunctory business. The House stands in recess until 1 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the House will be back in order."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 645, Flinn, a Bill for an Act . . . Act making an appropriation for the Jai Alai Control Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 646, Kempiners, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 647, Kempiners, a Bill for an Act in relation to merit systems for sheriff's personnel. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 648, Hudson-Brummet, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Commission on Atomic Energy. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels, are you seeking recognition? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Only to point out, Mr. Speaker, that your sheriff, the Sheriff of DuPage County is here to view your actions. Sheriff Wayne 'Shimp', County of DuPage."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you do? I understand that when you were the guest in his lodging that he always gave you warm coffee, is that right? Representative . . . Wayne 'Shimp', the Sheriff of DuPage County. One of the reasons why we changed the law that we'd permit a sheriff to succeed himself. Mr. Doorkeeper, there's a lot of unauthorized persons on the floor. Representative Ryan, can you come forward?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, will I need a bodyguard to come up among that group?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, send Skinner. Representative Skinner and Catania. You and Representative Catania will protect Representative Ryan."

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





Speaker Redmond: "The Chairman of Appropriations I on the floor? What's the status of your meeting this afternoon . . . Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "I intended to meet, we only have one Bill. I can do whatever you want me to do."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm trying to case the joint and see what we're going to do here. Representative Yourell, what's your status on your Committee today?"

Yourell: "Yes, what do you want to know, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, what . . . we're having problems on scheduling. What's your status of your Committee this afternoon?"

Yourell: "Well, we . . . I have a lot of Bills and a lot of witnesses down and . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "That's all I wanted to know."

Yourell: ". . . and I'm moving from Room 310 because of that to Room 118."

Speaker Redmond: "So it's important that you pursue your . . ."

Yourell: "Yes, it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Madigan. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would any Democrats interested in the question of House Bills 615 and 616 . . . the question of limited licenses come to my office immediately. Any Democrats, and I presume they would have attended the recent conference who's interested in the question of House Bills 615 and 616 come to my office immediately and let's talk about it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, what would you suggest . . . and be that we recess now and permit the Committees to proceed and then come back on the floor some later date this afternoon after we make some decisions. How does that strike you, Representative Ryan? Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "That's fine with me, Mr. Speaker. We've got to move the state's business. I think it's a good idea."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what happens to the Committees that are supposed to meet at 4 o'clock today?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's what we want to do is to have the Committee



meetings this afternoon and then come back in here after the Committees so that we accommodate the witnesses that are coming to Committees. And we accommodate the Members that want to have some input on 615 and 616."

Geo-Karis: "Well, then I understand from what you are saying that we are just going to take up those particular Bills this afternoon, is that right? Or are we going to have the rules?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the rules begin to look difficult."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, we just can't postpone the rules until next week and just spend a whole day on rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's what it's beginning to look like."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What I'm trying to do...it would seem to me that we should have the Committees this afternoon, and then come back in here after the Committees are over and do what we can when we get through. We have some serious decisions to make with respect to 615 and 616. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the 2 o'clock Committees meet at 3 o'clock, that the 4 o'clock Committees meet at 4 o'clock, and that the we come back into floor Session at 5 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, for the second week in a row we have been notified at the last minute that the Elections Committee has been cancelled out. We do have the opportunity now to meet. And I was wondering if this would also include the Elections Committee meeting today in proceeding with those matters that are pending."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. Those are matters for the Committees themselves. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Oh, I was just going to say, Mr. Speaker, if it's okay with Representative Geo-Karis it's okay with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, certain of the Chairmen have informed me that they will need more time in Committee. I would revise my suggestion to this. 2 o'clock Committees meet at 3 o'clock, 4 o'clock Committees meet at 4:30, floor Session at 6 o'clock."



Speaker Redmond: "Is he putting that in the form of a motion? . . ."

Madigan: ". . . Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in regards to Representative Bluthardt's question, the reason I understand the Elections Committee was cancelled was because of the Rules meeting. Now, we don't have one; and I think that we ought to know whether there's going to be a Rules meeting or not. And if there isn't, why."

Speaker Redmond: "Are the Rules meeting?"

Ryan: "I mean, Elections, Elections."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's pretty obvious that the scheduling this afternoon was complicated by the . . . the Governor's package of 615 and 616. Now, we're trying our best to accommodate everybody here."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there really wasn't any problem up un . . . on the Elections Committee. If everybody else can have their Committee meeting this afternoon, I don't know why the Elections Committee can't meet if we're not going to have the Rules now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec, do you seek recognition?"

Matijevec: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I heard the Majority Leader ask if any Democrats are interested in 615 and 616 to go to his office. But then I also heard that Committees are meeting. And I'm Chairman of the Committee, and I think we've got . . . everybody is a Member of a Committee. We can't do both. We can't go in his office and go to Committee too, especially a Chairman of the Committee. And . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I proposed a five or a ten minute meeting."

Matijevec: "I'll be there."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, there's a motion on the floor, Representative Madigan, that the 2 o'clock Committees meet at 3, that the 4 o'clock Committees meet at 4:30, and we'll come back on the House floor at what time? 6 o'clock. Representative Yourell on the motion."

Yourell: "No, not on the motion. I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead."

Yourell: "I want to remind all Members of the Counties and Townships



Committee we are not meeting in 310, but rather 118."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Kosin . . . we're in recess now. We'll be back here . . ."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification. Do I understand that when we get back in Session at 6 o'clock our consideration will be House Bill 615 and 616."

Speaker Redmond: "No, no. The regular order of business when we come back in. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "The Members of the St. Patricks and St. Josephs Day Committee will meet in the Speaker's Office in about 10 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Committees meet at 3 o'clock, 2 o'clock, the others at 4:30, back on the House floor at 6. Between now and 3 o'clock the St. Patricks Day and the St. Josephs Day, St. Santa Claus Day, St. 'Weschesclaus Day, St. Valentines Day meeting, St. Jude, I think, too. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for a point of recognition and announcement. We have three gentlemen seated up in the balcony to my left from Tazewell County, members of the County Board there, Jack Cranwell, Earl Urish and Moon Mullens; and we . . . Moon Mullens . . . they are from the 45th District, which of course is very, very ably represented by Representative Von Boeckman, Representative Luft and Representative Anderson. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham. Of course, you've realized we've adjourned . . . we've recessed . . . recessed, listened to Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "How long . . . Mr. Speaker, how kind of you to hear me even at this late hour. Heretofore, your keeping the schedule has made life easier for all of us, but in candor I must say that you've become as arbitrary as your predecessor. I wanted to ask specifically, we had a dinner for the House Members of the Appropriations I set for 6:30 this evening. And we planned in accordance with your prior schedule. What would suggest, how long will we be here at 6 o'clock?"



Is there any chance that we can change this situation?"

Speaker Redmond: "That depends on the Membership. I am their servant."

Cunningham: "But . . . how long would you anticipate that we be in Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "At least until . . ."

Cunningham: "I'm stuck with the bill already, should I have it served on the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: ". . . I don't think . . . about 10 o'clock. If you want . . . if you really promised to pay the bill."

Cunningham: "I like the old bill even better than the new."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm sorry. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Chairman of the Elections Committee would tell my Members whether there's going to be a meeting or not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "No, there's not going to be a meeting of the Elections Committee this afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, I don't understand that, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have an explanation on that. Why there's no meeting when all the rest of the Committees are going to meet."

Speaker Redmond: "Well . . . the House is . . . the House is in recess now. You can talk to Representative Laurino if you want to. We've got 3 o'clock Committees, 4:30 Committees. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ryan, it may have been a mistake to cancel the meeting; but we have the witnesses who were to testify on some of the Election Board Bills that have been notified not to come because of the cancellation. And now we find ourselves in this posture. So that is the reason why the cancellation stays."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order, the Members please be in their seats. Committee Reports."



Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevec, Chairman . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations I to which the following Bill was referred. Action taken March 9, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation, 'do pass' House Bill 417. A message from the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "A message 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 has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Preamble and Joint Resolution to wit, House Joint Resolution #10, concurred in by the Senate March 9, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 649, Gerald Bradley, a Bill for an Act in relation to the certification of supervisory personnel and include service establishments. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 650, Richmond, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 651, Beatty, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workman's Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 652, Laurino, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to the investigation and the prevention of fire. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 653, Lucco, a Bill for an Act to restore access rights to property adjacent to Federal route . . . Federal Aid Route 12 in Madison County. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading, is House Bill 10, capital punishment. Is there anybody in their offices listening to the sound of my voice who cares to address himself to the problem of capital punishment? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Kosinski, I should like to move that that Bill lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on Representative Schlickman's motion?"



Schlickman: "Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Schlickman: "I'm just doing what I was told to do."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "My motion to strike the enacting clause of House Bill 10 takes precedence over Mr. Schlickman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: ". . . Mr. Speaker, I think it's entirely unfair to strike the enacting clause on Representative Kosinski's Bill when he's not even here."

Speaker Redmond: "Well maybe what we ought to do is to go to rules of Amendment #6. Is there anybody that wants to address himself to Amendment #6 to the rules? What's this? An Amendment . . . an Amendment for the United States . . . Amendment to the U.S. Constitution that requires the . . . 118 instead of 107, is that right? Is that what this Amendment says? Are you ready to discuss that question? But it takes 118 instead of 107 on the Amendments to the United States Constitution. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, my Amendment says 177."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you leave your Amendment, Mr. Schlickman? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering about how long we are going to be in Session tonight because some of us have been on strict diets and we count on eating on a certain time; but, of course; if you don't think we'll finish before 10 o'clock at night, then we'll order some dry food and eat it here."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we can tell better when we see how amenable the Membership is when we go to the question of rules. I would think maybe 9 o'clock."

Geo-Karis: "9 o'clock."

Speaker Redmond: "I would think so. On the order of . . . On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 94. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, we . . . may I inquire of the Chair as to whether or not it is absolutely necessary that Amendments be called in order of their numbers."



Speaker Redmond: "I believe the rules indicate that that's the way it's supposed to be done. And that if we leave that order, why we're supposed to go back where we left off. The Sponsor can remove it from the record; and I think we'll be reasonable."

Madison: "If the Sponsor has to remove one from the record, Mr. Speaker, will that Sponsor have an opportunity if not tonight at a later time to bring it back up?"

Speaker Redmond: "I would think so, yes."

Madison: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any Amendments to . . . Representative Katz. Representative Madison, can you step up here for a minute, please? House Resolution 94. House Resolution 94. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was distributed last week a memorandum prepared by the Parliamentarian which summarized all of the changes that the Rules Committee proposed with regard to the rules. I do not propose to go over those. I know that everyone is anxious to move along. They were well summarized, and the points will be raised by the Amendments that have been offered. Accordingly then, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the Clerk move ahead to Amendment #1 and we can proceed through the Amendments quickly so that we can have House rules early and get our handbook printed and in the hands of the Members so they can use it throughout this current Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Kane, amends House Resolution 94 on page 11 by striking lines 24 through 30."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Amendment #1 does is strike the language of Rule 17(b) in the Resolution #94. The language that is struck from the proposed rules, I'd like to read it, and I think we all ought to listen to it very carefully. And what the language of 17(b) says is that a Committee may hold a hearing only on a matter referred, or assigned or committed to it or on a matter within the scope of an authorizing or directing Resolution adopted by the House, except that a Committee may conduct a general





informational hearing on a topic or to hear expert or technical witnesses if authorized . . . if authorized by the Committee on the Assignment of Bills. What Rule 17(b) does is absolutely destroy the power of Committees. This language says that any Committee can only deal with legislation referred to it, unless it is given permission by a House Resolution or the Committee on Assignment of Bills. I hope the Committee Chairmen are listening because if this rule passes as it's now stated in 17(b) Committees will be able to do nothing without the okay of the Committee on Assignment of Bills. I'm a Member of the Committee on Higher Education, and over the last three weeks we've had the Scholarship Commission in, we've had the Board of Higher Education in, we've had an awful lot of other state agencies in to talk to us about what's happening in higher education. Under the language of 17(b), we would not have been able to do that without the permission of the Committee on the Assignment of Bills. The Appropriations Committee will not be able to call in departments or department directors to talk to them about how they are spending the state's money unless they have a Bill before them. No Committee will be able to act on its own. No Committee Chairman will be able to charter the course of his Committee without first passing a Resolution in the House or getting permission of the Committee on Assignment of Bills. A lot of us are fond of saying that it's the Committee . . . that it's in the Committees that we do the work of the House. And that we should try to strengthen the Committee system. But if we allow 17(b) to become part of the rules, we might as well scrap our Committees and fire our Chairmen. And I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I heartily concur with what Representative Kane has said. I think this is a terrible Amendment. I don't really know whose idea it is; but I would say it would give tremendous power to the Committee on Assignment because if it were adopted the obvious route taken would be not the Resolution to the House floor, but to go to the Committee on Assignment and ask permission. The Committee has enough power. I think this would



almost emasculate the Committee system. And I hope to heaven we don't adopt this particular Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor if I may."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Well, under the present rules this wasn't . . . I didn't quite get . . . with the noise volume back here . . . just how your Amendment would better the situation."

Kane: "My Amendment strikes 17(b), to remove the language of 17(b)."

Geo-Karis: "All right, but what do you do with your Amendment? By striking the language, doesn't the Committee still have to hold a hearing and the matter referred?"

Kane: "No, what it . . . 17(b) restricts Committees to holding hearings only on Bills we could not have informational hearings unless we got permission from the Committee on Assignment of Bills. I see it . . . if Committees should be autonomous, Committees should be able to hold hearings on any matter within their jurisdiction and they shouldn't have to wait for Bills to be assigned to the Committees - to hold hearings, nor should they have to go to the Committee on Assignment of Bills to ask permission to hold hearings."

Geo-Karis: "Well, under 17(b) it's evident . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, your phone is ringing."

Geo-Karis: ". . . under 17(b) it says that 'Except that a Committee may conduct a general informational hearing on a topic or to hear experts or technical witnesses'."

Kane: "If they have permission."

Geo-Karis: "By the Committee on Assignments."

Kane: "Right. Well, we shouldn't have to go to the Committee on Assignment of Bills to get permission."

Geo-Karis: "In the midst of that case, then I will speak in favor of your Amendment. I think it's a very good Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "After the age of 30 one probably starts developing a philosophy. And if I have one, it's in favor of decentralization of power and opposed to centralization of power. I guess that makes me a conserva-



tive Populist as Senator Bloom put it yesterday. I think for that reason that Representative Kane's Amendment is an extremely good Amendment. And if indeed we believe in decentralization of power and believe that all of us, each of us, are smarter than any of the rest of us and should have as much influence as any of the rest of us, this Amendment has to be passed or else we will be just capitulated to about two or three people."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in opposition to Amendment #1. This Amendment as drafted would simply and completely delete Rule 17(b). And that that effect of this Amendment then would be to in effect place no restriction whatever on the action of our Committees. In other words, a Committee could do whatever it wants without any standard or frame of reference. Now, let's remember that our Committees do have powers, including subpoena powers. There has to be some kind of a standard or a frame of reference within and under which the Committee must take action. Now, the rule provides that an informational hearing may be held by a Committee. It doesn't have to be simply on a Bill or on a directory Resolution, it can also be on a proposal. I submit that Representative Kane's Amendment is far too sweepy, it's far too broad and it would create the potential for a great deal of mischief. I would ask the Membership to defeat the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Telcser: "Representative Kane, apparently your Amendment, a copy of which I have not yet seen, doesn't provide for how the Committee on its own initiative would decide to do something, investigate something, hold a hearing or what have you. Would it be upon the desire of the Chairman that he require a certain number of people on the Committees to initiate the action. My point is, how are we . . . how are the minority Members of the Committee brought into the decision-making process regarding when a Committee would do something?"

Kane: "The same way you are now. Right now we had . . . we have a



Committee on Higher Education of which I'm a part, and the Membership of the Committee decided that we wanted to call in the Board of Higher Education and the Scholarship Commission to talk to us about their programs. And I think that's perfectly proper. We shouldn't . . . as the Committee on Higher Education, we should not have to go to the Committee on Assignment of Bills to ask if we can call in the Board of Higher Education. That's ridiculous."

Telcser: "All right, and how would we handle, Representative, the question of funding and money if the Committees would decide to engage in activities that would require money out of the Speaker's Office or whatever? Do you have funding for that?"

Kane: "That's . . . that's up to the Speaker. No Committee could spend money under these rules or going to the Committee on Assignment of Bills, except pursuant to an appropriation. The Committee on Assignment of Bills couldn't give you any money to spend either."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, although I do have a few questions regarding Representative Kane's proposed Amendment to the rules, I do think it has merits. I do think it leaves with the Membership the rights to do something. And I would hope as is the practice now, the Committee Chairman, along with the Committee Spokesman, would make joint decisions. And perhaps, Representative Kane, before we get to the end of this Amendment process, you and I could talk about an Amendment to add some language to protect the rights of the Minority regarding decisions Committees would make. Could we . . . could we take yours out of the record, and change it?"

Kane: "There are other Amendments that do the same thing that come later. I'm sure that you could work with them. I think that the language in 17(b) is now so pernicious that we can't even protect the rights of the Majority of a Committee much less the Minority. And I think we ought to strike that language. And then if you want to go and do something different, I'd be glad to help you; but I think we have to get rid of this language now."

Telcser: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in



support of Representative Kane's motion. I would like to point out to the Members of the House that this is . . . if his motion passes the Committees will conduct their business exactly the way they now conduct their business. That the proposed rule which he suggests striking is new language in any event. So we are . . . if this Amendment passes simply striking the new language in the rule. So I am a little puzzled as to Representative Houlihan's suggestion as to a great mischief might be at work because I'm not aware that there was a significant mischief at work under the older rules. Perhaps that is a problem that I have as a new Member of the House. I didn't see how the Committee system worked last Session; but I think the burden is on those who would show that there was mischief worked by the former system. Also I would point out another difference between the old rules and the new rules. In the new rules there's no mention of jurisdiction of responsibility for the Committees. The Committees are simply listed under Rule 14. There is no language in the rules as proposed which would define their jurisdictions which might give them the responsibility to act on their initiative. I think that in the absence of any such language this places a considerable amount of power in the hands of the Assignment of Bills Committee and takes a substantial amount of power away from the individual Committees. At the very least the old rules suggested that a Resolution should be prepared and introduced on the subject by February 1st of this year. I'm sorry to see that such a Resolution was not prepared and introduced. In conclusion, I simply urge my fellow Members to continue the status quo in this particular respect, continue allowing the Committees to initiate matters on their own behalf and I support Representative Kane's Amendment and ask that everyone else join me in this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Kane, under the proposed House Resolution 94, it's my understanding that Committees would not then be able to look into a problem area at the direction of the Chairman of the



Committee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes?"

Houlihan, J.: "Could I have some order, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll try. I can't get unauthorized persons off the floor, so I don't know if I can get you order or not. I would wish that the Members cooperate with the Chair and also with the rules to not grant permission to people to use Members' chairs and phones on Members' desks. It's absolutely in contravention of the rules. Please give the Gentleman order and all unauthorized persons leave the floor. Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Kane, is it your understanding that House Resolution 94 would prohibit the effective use of a Committee structure to develop Committee Bills to deal with problem areas in the Committee jurisdiction?"

Kane: "Yes."

Houlihan, J.: "So, in effect, the Committee could only consider, if your Amendment is not adopted, could only consider matters which were brought before it by individual Members or by the Assignment Committee, is that correct?"

Kane: "No, it wouldn't be able to consider anything brought to it by an individual Member unless that Member introduced a Bill and that Bill had been assigned to that Committee."

Houlihan, J.: "I'm sorry, that's what I meant was a request by an individual Member by way of a Bill."

Kane: "And has that Bill assigned to that Committee, yes?"

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment because I think the entire thrust of our rules should be to strengthen the Committee structure, to give that Committee of researching, developing the fact and the issues and outlining where we should go as a House in general when we're considering a particular problem. In the past, we have talked about the inability of the Committees to effectively operate. And I think here we're going across purposes because we're ruling out an effective means of having the Committee strengthened because, in effect, what we're saying is the Committees' hands are tied and they cannot



consider anything but Bills that are assigned to it. This, I might suggest, would only increase the number of Bills we would consider. It would make us much more of a Bill processing, rather than an issue-solving Body. And, therefore, I would urge the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative . . . Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to rise in support of this Amendment to the rules. I think that this proposed rule would do great mischief to the Committee system in the House of Representatives. It was suggested that the Amendment did mischief; but the real result is that mischief would be accomplished by the proposed rules to the representative character of the House of Representatives and to its Committee because the Committees would be so restricted that we would effectively no longer have real Committee structure in the House of Representatives. The Committees as we have known them would be purely mechanical bodies to hear only the evidence and take the 'yeas' and 'nays' on specific Bills assigned to them by the Committee on Assignment or authorities given to them by the Committee on Assignment or authority presented to them by a Resolution of the entire House, which has not been true in the past. The Committees have had considerable opportunity to investigate into matters that related to the kinds of business that was before them, to bring solutions of matters and suggestions for Bills and, yes, even to create Bills and bring them to the House of Representatives, and to really serve the interests of all of the people in this House and not just the interests of a few. If we were to adopt this rule, and not to adopt this Amendment, it would mean that we would effectively have only one real Committee in the House of Representatives, and that Committee would be the Committee on Assignments, which would control each and every bit of business that would go to the Standing Committees of the House of Representatives. I would suggest that the Members and certainly the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of a Committee consider seriously if this Amendment is not adopted whether there is any purpose really in serving on Committees



in the House of Representatives. And I would certainly urge that this Amendment be adopted and this rule rejected. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as I have been considering the proposed rules for the Eightieth General Assembly I have been more convinced that what we ought to do tonight is simply to adopt the temporary rules as the permanent rules. And I think the issue that is raised in Amendment #1 is a prime piece of evidence that we ought to stay with what we've got. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we all know that any set of rules is no better, no worse than their administration and the spirit by which they're complied with. Now, Mr. Speaker, a hallmark of your administration is the evolution of the Committee system here in the House of Representatives. Under your Leadership, the Committees have functioned as deliberative Bodies, they have functioned as problem solvers. Someone mentioned at the outset of this debate that the Amendment was broad sweeping. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what's broad sweeping is the language that this Amendment would delete, brand new language, never a part of the rules of the House of Representatives. This language, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that ought to be deleted by the adoption of this Amendment will vest in two persons a majority of the Committee on Assignment of Bills absolute control over the operation and functioning of the Committees of this House. It's this language, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that is fearful, that is awesome. And I respectfully suggest in conclusion, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we overwhelmingly adopt Amendment #1 to House Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt. Representative Brandt, would you put his microphone on? Representative Brandt has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'; the motion carries. Representative Kane."

Kane: "I think this Amendment has been debated fully; and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."





Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Do you want your oral Roll Call?"

Skinner: "Yes, I'd like to know who's in favor of this."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #2."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Kane, amends House Bill 94 on page 4, line 17, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 is really a very simple Amendment. It's the Freedom of Information for the Member's Amendment or it's an Amendment that will free us from 80 percent of the paper that comes across our desks. The Leadership doesn't read this Amendment because they have the staff to keep Amendments in order and tell them where all the Amendments go and what they all mean. This is an Amendment for the Membership. What this Amendment says is that we want the Bills on our desks in a way in which we can understand them before we have to vote on them. It's an Amendment that says that we don't want Bill Books piled six feet high on our desks and Amendments dumped helter-skelter one after the other without any way of our keeping track of them. For those of you who haven't been here before, and all you've seen so far are white Amendments coming across your desks, wait until the blue ones come, and the green ones come, and the pink ones come, and the white ones come. There's no way of keeping track of them all. House Resolution 94 goes only halfway in giving us what we need to be able to vote intelligently on the floor. House Resolution 94 as it is now says that Amendments adopted in Committee are deemed to be adopted, and that we don't have to redo everything that the Committees do. That's a step in the right direction; but there is one more step that needs to be taken. And that's the step that will let us Members know what the Committees have done to Bills in Committee by-way of Committee Amendments. And there's no way that we can do that while juggling a Bill Book in one hand and five and six different Amendments in the other, all changing different lines in different



pages and try to make sense out of what the Committee did, much less try to draft an Amendment to change what the Committee did, an Amendment that won't be ruled out of order by the Chair because it amends the wrong lines. What this Amendment to the rules says is that when a Committee finishes with a Bill, that Bill will be retyped with all the Amendments included, that the Bill will be reproduced . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf, for what purpose do you arise?"

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry. We are on Amendment 2, I believe?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Wolf: "It seems to me this says 'striking on page 26, line 23, by striking the word 'action''; and I'm looking on line 23. There is no word 'action' on line 23. Unless I'm mistaken, it's on line 22."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane. Kane."

Wolf: "On line 5 of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, it says on page 22, line 23, by striking 'action and' and inserting in lieu, thereof . . . and I'm looking on line 23, I don't see any word 'action'. It's on line 22. I think the Amendment is technically incorrect."

Kane: "If the . . . If the Clerk would change on the face of it '23' to '22' . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to change on the face? Hearing no objection, Mr. Clerk, will you make the change. Representative D. L. Houlihan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Houlihan, D.: "It appears . . . it appears, Mr. Speaker, that there is another technical error. Line 7 of the Amendment refers to on page 25 I believe it should be page 26."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave granted to change that on the face? Representative Kane hasn't . . . hearing no objections, Mr. Clerk, will you make the change on the face of the Amendment? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Has Representative Kane finished?"

Kane: "No."

Telcser: "Well, when the Gentleman is finished, I want to speak to the Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "What this Amendment to House Resolution 94 says is that when a Committee finishes with a Bill that Bill is retyped with all the Amendments included, reproduced and distributed to the House on our desks as a single Bill. so that we, as Members, can look at one piece of paper and know what it is that we're working on and voting on. If you want to know what you're doing . . ."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if I understand this correctly, we gave leave to amend the Amendment on its face relative to the issue that Representative Dan Houlihan brought up. And as I look at the Resolution amending it on its face as he requested does not correct the technical error."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian here perhaps? Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I've looked at this in the preceding material ends that line 'action.'. And then by striking what follows and inserting in lieu, thereof, Subsection G, it does correct it if...do amend it on its face."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Mr. Kane."

Kane: ". . . What this Amendment to the rules says that when a Committee finishes with a Bill that that Bill is retyped with all the Amendments included, reproduced and distributed to us as a single Bill so that we can look at it on one piece of paper and know what it is that we're working on and voting on. If you want to know what you're doing between now and the end of June, vote for this Amendment. If you want only those . . . the Sponsor of the Bill and the Leadership to know what's happening, then vote against this Amendment. In summary, this Amendment is the freedom from paper Amendment, it's an abolish the clutter on our desks' Amendment, get rid of the six foot high Bill Books Amendment. If this Amendment is passed, only the Bills that come out of Committee will be in our Bill Books on the floor and only the Amendments that are offered on the floor will



cross our desks. We'll have clean Bills to work with, Bills that we can readily read and understand. This Amendment, for those of you who were here six, eight, ten years ago, is offered in memory of Art Simmons from Cook County who sat in that chair right over there. He was the only Member in the House for many Sessions who devoted all of his time to keeping track of all the Bills and all of the Amendments. His was the only Bill Book on the floor of this House that was in order; but he never had time to do anything else. What this Amendment says is that we all want our Bill Books to be in order, and we all want to know what we're voting on, and we still want time to do everything else that we have to do, like answer our mail and return our telephone calls and work on our own Bills.

I urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Representative Kane poses a very interesting and a provocative question regarding the orderly procedures of the House. We discussed this proposal in the Rules Committee at great length . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers, for what purpose do you arise?"

Byers: "Wasn't Representative Kane closing on his Amendment? Weren't we supposed to take a vote on that?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, that was Amendment #1, this is Amendment #2. We're just beginning this one." Representative Telcser."

Telcser: ". . . Now, the Gentleman's proposal, while it is . . . it has merits, and while an Amendment which we will be considering later in the evening deals to some extent with the problem, I think that perhaps that Representative Kane's idea is before its time. In the first place, while we're discussing this Amendment in Committee, the Representative's proposal, the Clerk informed us that it was being very difficult, if not close to impossible, for the Clerk's Office to keep up with enrolling Bills, with Amendments from Committees, have them come up on the floor, and then have them enrolled again. Jack, if-I'm wrong . . . the Clerk is nodding his head 'yes' . . . I would also like to make the point to the Members that this would put an exceptionally great burden on the part of the Members with regard to



keeping track of what is in the Bills. Most of the time, Members refer to their Digests when Bills are on Second Reading to see what the Bill is about. And they're able to hear the Amendments being adopted on the floor. If Bills come up engrossed after Committee action, the Digest may or may not keep up with the engrossed Bill. The Bill may be totally different from what was introduced. And what's more, this is the crux of the problem I think with the Gentleman's proposal, the Amendment would not appear on your desks, as I understand your proposal, Representative Kane. A Bill would come out of Committee with the Amendments adopted, engrossed; and would, therefore, be the Bill we're considering so that the Members would not have an opportunity to see what Amendment was adopted in Committee, what the actual language was in the Bill prior to the adoption of the Amendment and make a judgment whether or not they want to be for or against the Bill, or whether or not they wish to offer an Amendment regarding to what could amount to the new piece of legislation. Now, I agree in principle with what Representative Kane wants to do. He is correct when he says that we spend about 80 percent of our time on Second Reading adopting Amendments from the floor which have been adopted in Committee. But his proposal, I believe, puts too great a burden too soon at the Members at this time. And in addition to that, it puts a great burden on the part of the Clerk's Office to keep up with the workload. Amendment . . . There is an Amendment which I think will go half way, which we will be discussing later in the evening, as I said earlier, which provides that the Amendments come up to the floor that are adopted by the Committee, and the Members would have a chance to amend the Bill to alter the contents of the Amendment if they wish. But the point is they would see the Amendment. And so I think the Gentleman's proposal reluctantly ought to be defeated. I don't think it will accomplish at this time the purpose which he wants to accomplish. And so, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I . . . I would recommend that we vote 'no' on the Gentleman's proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what the



Gentleman proposes is a separate, additional printing of all the Bills that we have after they come out of the Committee. Now, I will tell you that all of us will be pouring Bills in in the next few weeks. And the Clerks and the printer will have a very difficult time printing the actual Bills that we put in. But the idea that they could, not only print those Bills once, but print them twice is absolutely unrealistic. And the Clerk tells us that we will be mired down in this House unable to operate because of the double printing involved. Accordingly, the Rules Committee, and what I recall was an almost unanimous, if not a total unanimous vote, was not able to go along with this part of Mr. Kane's proposal; but they did go along with his proposal for the automatic adoption of Amendments. Half a loaf is all that the House realistically can do. It is absolutely vital that this Amendment be defeated unless we will be totally mired down in the double printing of the Bills in the coming months ahead."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yeah, I tend to agree with the Spokesman from the House Rules Committee because there is a way to accomplish what Representative Telcser wants that Representative Kane has not incorporated as an Amendment. There is a process if one is going to print, whereby, the Membership can know what the Committee has put on. All you have to do is lay about a 20 percent of screen, a layer of dust over the language that the Committee has put in. I proposed such an Amendment #37 to House Resolution 237 last year; and until something like that comes out, if you want to know what the Committee did, you'd better vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Doug, if this Amendment is passed, do you not feel that it would be possible for us if we became mired down in the printing process as Representative Katz suggests to then be able to suspend a rule if that was the only way out of that dilemma?"

Kane: "I'm sure that that would be the case. We've suspended every other



rule. And I'm sure that if we became mired down we could suspend the rules. I have other things to say about some of the allegations that have been made about printing; but your point is well taken."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative . . ."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . proceed."

Satterthwaite: ". . . then I would like to emphasize the fact that we would be far better off adopting this Amendment and if it becomes necessary to bypass this procedure we can suspend the rules at that time. When we are able to comply with the Amendment and its provisions, it would be of help to the Membership to have such an Amendment in our rules. And I would suggest that we strongly support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "There've been a number of statements made about this Amendment that I think are somewhat inaccurate. The question of double printing was brought up. As a matter of fact, every Bill that goes through this House is printed twice. It's printed when it's introduced and it's printed when it's passed. What this Bill says . . . what this Amendment would do is say, 'Well, we're going to do that second printing in time to be of assistance to the House, rather than just to be in time to be of assistance to the Senate'. What this Amendment, if it is passed, would do is for some Bills would require three printings rather than two. And the only Bills that it would require three printings rather than two are Bills that are amended both in Committee and on the floor of the House. That's the only additional engrossing or printing that this Amendment would require. We would not as some Representatives would have you think double printing every Bill. We would only be giving an additional printing to those few Bills that are amended both in Committee and on the floor of the



House. There's been another statement made that it would be difficult for Members to know what a Committee has done. Very simple, all a Member would have to do instead of trying to juggle six Amendments and a six-foot high Bill Book is to look at the Bill as it was introduced and compare it to the Bill as it comes out of Committee. I think that's a very simple thing to do. It's been alleged that this would make it difficult for the Clerk's Office to handle. I think that it's more important to make our jobs easier and make it easier for us to know what we're doing. We can always hire two or three more people in the Clerk's Office. I would urge the adoption of this Amendment. It would make it much easier for us as we go through the rest of this Session to know what it is that we're doing."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #2 to House Resolution 94. Those in favor of the adoption say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the Gentleman has requested a Roll Call. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If any of you have any problems finding Amendments on your desks, trying to keep track of the Amendments with the Bills that as they come printed and left on your desks, then you should support this Amendment of Representative Kane's to the rules. If you'll look over here, I've got my Bills separated into loose-leaf notebooks. The Pages can't keep track of the Bills, although they do a very good job in trying, and the Amendments. And you just have a stack of Amendments placed on your desks, which you just . . . I find it very difficult to comprehend. I think the Rules Committee have done a commendable job on . . . for getting the rules to the Members of this Body that they have. But the handling of Committee Amendments as suggested by Representative Kane represents an innovative, imaginative solution to the problem. And when the Bills get out of Committee, they will be on your desks, enrolled and engrossed as amended. You'll be able to more quickly, and more promptly and more ably analyze the Bill as it is presented to you on Second Reading. And I would urge all of the Members of the House to accept this Amendment, to try





this system suggested by Representative Kane to avoid the very frustrating process of trying to find, analyze and vote on Amendments that are thrown on your desks by the Pages, some time in such high volume that you can't even find one from another."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd like to remind the Membership that although some have said that this would cost some more because of printing. I would suggest to you that it will certainly not be a waste. Because a waste is occurring in the way that we proceed now. Amendments come to us thrown haphazard in every direction all over your desks, 50, 60, as we get later into the Session maybe 100 at a time. No one knows where those Amendments are. It's impossible to find them when the Bill comes up on Second Reading. And where do they wind up? They wind up on the floor and in . . . in the wastebasket. When some of us first came here the Pages used to be assigned specific desks. And every Amendment was put in the Bill Book exactly beside the Bill so that at least you could find the Amendments in order and you could find the Bill, no matter what that Bill might be. But these books got about six foot high. This way if we would adopt this Amendment those Amendments would be drafted in the Bill, that Bill would be on your desks, there would be no more of these piles, and piles and piles of Amendments, and Resolutions and other documents coming on your desks that you throw away like confetti. And they would really be useful. I would urge the Membership, in the interest of knowing what is in the Bill that we are called upon to pass, to adopt this very excellent Amendment that is proposed now. It's an Amendment that will help each of you here on the floor. And if the cost is slightly more, it is cost that is well spent because the people will have their Representatives voting on Bills that they know what they contain. And it will be a great help to each and every one of us. Thank you very much."

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

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I would like to say that as a freshman it's



extremely difficult to follow the Bills. And it's even more difficult to follow the Bills as amended. As Representative Tipsword just said, it's impossible to keep up with the Amendments when there's 60 of them on your desks. And you're trying to thumb through and find out the Bill and how it has been amended and keep track of it. If we adopt this, we are not going to reprint every Bill. We're not going to add a third printing to every Bill. We're going to add a third printing only to those Bills that have been amended on the floor, which is about 20 percent of the Bills. The cost increase . . . the cost of printing increase is 20 percent, that's a small price for the people of Illinois to pay to have their Representatives know what's going on up here. Thank you."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 66 'aye' and 88 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion . . . Representative Kane."

Kane: "I'd ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Anderson, E. M. Barnes, Bradley, Don Brummet, Corneal Davis, Deavers, Ebbeser, Ewell . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I withdraw that request."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has withdrawn his request for the poll of the absentees. On this question there's 8 . . . 66 'ayes', 88 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. Amendment # . . . Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. And simply to point out to the Membership that we have voted on two Amendments now and in each case we have sustained the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly rules, which are our temporary rules. And it seems to me we ought to just be consistent and readopt the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly rules as our permanent rules and go home."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Filed on your desks is a motion to that effect. I wonder when that it would be appropriate to call it. You might save us all a lot



of time."

Speaker Redmond: "Tomorrow, Amendment #3."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Kane, amends House Resolution 94 on pages 17 and 18 by striking all of Rule 25 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Well, I'm batting 50-50. This is the . . . the tie breaker.

Amendment #3 is really a very simple Amendment. It simply changes the whole approach the House has chosen to take in the last 14 years to deal with the large number of Bills that are introduced and the logjams that always developed at the end of Sessions. For 14 years we in the House have set earlier and earlier deadlines and the only result has been that the logjams have become longer and longer and they started earlier and lasted later. What Amendment #3 does is abolish all deadlines in the rules. And the Rules Committee made a start by abolishing the automatic tabling . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle, for what purpose do you arise? Proceed, Representative Kane."

Kane: "The Rules Committee made a start by abolishing the automatic tabling of Bills if they were not called within 45 days of being introduced. This Amendment finishes that process, it abolishes all automatic tabling rules, which are ridiculous on the face of them. Instead what this Amendment would do, is give to the Rules Committee the power to regulate the number of Bills and the flow of legislation coming onto the floor of the House. Opening it up in the early part of the Session and closing it down at the end of the Session. This is done very simply by giving the Rules Committee the power to set a limit on the number of Bills that can be reported out of a standing Committee onto the floor in any one week. This will force Committees to set priorities, to spend more time on fewer Bills and act on the important measures first. Some have argued that this gives the Rules Committee too much power. In fact, what this Amendment does is take away a good deal of the power that the present rules in House Resolution 94 gives to the Rules Committee. The effect of this Amendment is to shift power from the Rules Committee to all of the other standing Committees. Under this Amendment, the Rules Committee



would have no power over individual Bills. All the Rules Committee would be able to do is set a limit on the number of Bills the Committee can vote out. And it will leave each individual Committee that decides which Bills will be considered and which Bills will be voted out. If you do not change these proposed rules, if you do not adopt this Amendment, the Rules Committee will have absolute power over every Bill for over three-fourths of the life of this General Assembly. When June 30th arrives this year, every Bill that you have dies unless the Rules Committee happens to decide to breathe life into it. We have to control the number . . . the number of Bills coming onto the floor of the House. And we can't be voting on 200 Bills on one Roll Call. This happened last Session. And no Committee should be posting 50 to 100 Bills per one hearing. The Rules Committee . . . the Leadership, if you will, should have the power to control the flow. But the Committee . . . the Membership should set the priorities. And this Amendment . . . this Amendment gives us that power taking it away from the Rules Committee. Deadlines have failed. They've been charged for 14 years. And they've failed for 14 years. And it's time we tried something new. I urge the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telecer."

Telecer: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion regarding Amendment #3. And although I am serving as a Member of the Rules Committee, and will always enjoy extra powers and privileges as any Member would, I do think it vests too much power in one Committee in the first instance. Secondly, it takes away from Committee prerogatives of powers, which the Gentleman tried to give to the Committee in his Amendment #1. The Committees can post the Bills, the Chairman and the Minority Spokesman can control the flow of legislation; but I think it is vesting too much power in one Committee for this House. I don't think it would work. I think it would act as a detriment to the House. It would put the Members of the Rules Committee, I might add, in a very tenuous position with the Members being under pressure to vote for Members' Bills to be posted and sent to Committees. It could and I



think would create conflicts between Members of the Rules Committee and Committee Chairmen, who seek to have some input regarding the flow of legislation going through their Committees. I, frankly, see no useful purpose for the Gentleman's Amendment to House Resolution 94, Amendment #3. I think the Committee Chairman along with the Spokesman can do fine regarding the flow of legislation in their Committees. And I would urge the Members to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle. Unauthorized persons please leave the floor."

Stuffle: "Will the Sponsor yield to two questions? First of all, Representative Kane . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative . . ."

Stuffle: ". . . Representative Kane, is there not a technical error at the bottom of the Amendment in the reference to page 20 . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Mr. Doorkeeper, will you come forward, please."

Stuffle: ". . . where you renumbered the Sections D, E and F as Sections B, C. and E? Should not the latter Section renumbered be Section D as opposed to E?"

Kane: "B and C were removed so D, E and F become B, C and D."

Stuffle: "And it is referred to in my copy of the Amendment as Section E renumbered, not D."

Kane: "Then that should be corrected."

Stuffle: "The second question is, would you explain the language . . . the meaning of the language in your new Subsection H, which refers to the Clerk of the House holding the excess Bills from a Committee. And it speaks to proceeding chronologically forward from the last Bill voted on by a Committee."

Kane: "When I made . . . when I made this proposal, the question was raised if the Rules Committee says to the Insurance Committee that the Insurance Committee can put out 10 Bills with a 'do pass' motion in a week. And the Insurance Committee actually votes out 12 Bills. What happens then? Under this rule, what it would say is that the first 10 Bills that the Insurance Committee voted out, those would immediately go to the floor of the House. The next two would be held by



the Clerk until the following week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Kane, would you yield to . . . would the Sponsor of this Amendment yield to a question?"

Kane: "Yes."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Kane, given a situation where the Rules Committee decided that the Labor and Commerce Committee could report out 3 Bills, and there were 14 Bills pending in that Committee. How would you describe the process by which that Committee would then determine its selection of those Bills to report out?"

Kane: "Under the present rules, the Chairman would set the agenda . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "That is not a . . . that is not a Member sitting in that chair, Mr. Doorkeeper. The rules provide that only Members may occupy Members' chairs. The rules provide that only Members may occupy the Members' chairs. You fellows voted on the rules, and you asked me to enforce them. Now if you don't like the, why change them. Representative Huff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, is there no such Rule 55 with . . . in regard to former Legislators?"

Speaker Redmond: "It doesn't say anything about sitting in a Members' chair. That's your rule, Representative Huff. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I find Amendment # . . . oh, excuse me."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Schlickman, we were in the middle of a question, I believe, when Representative . . . Representative Kane was responding when there was an interruption."

Kane: ". . . Under the present rules and to any procedures, the Chairman sets the agenda in this subject to Amendment by the Membership by the majority vote. And I would say that agendas and voting would be decided by the Membership of the Committee."

Houlihan, J.: "So, Representative Kane, your thought would be that the Chairman would indicate the order of call of Bills and that would have to be approved by the full Committee. And then there would be discussion, debate and subsequent vote on each of those Bills in that



order?"

Kane: "I would . . . I would hope so. I would hope that the Committees either through formal or informal procedures could, you know, take care of that problem."

Houlihan, J.: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I find Amendment #3 to be very offensive and demeaning. Instead of treating this Body as a Legislative Body with its subject matter being a hopper full of Bills, it treats this Chamber's as a slaughter yard, stockyard with carloads of cattle. It would treat the rights of citizens . . . constitutional rights of citizens as simply something to be moved along, expeditiously, without consideration as to quality. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this Amendment touches that sensitive nerve, the right of people to be represented, the right of people to be represented in this Body to consider their problems. It's most demeaning and offensive, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to have this kind of treatment of Bills. It's not cattle. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in opposition to this Amendment. As a freshman, I would point that under the seniority prevailing that we have in the House, and which I believe in, that this would be an excellent way for the senior Members of the House to see that no freshman Bill ever got out of Committee. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Just one question of the Sponsor. Representative Kane, what is your definition of an 'important Bill'?"

Kane: "I'm not sure that that . . . that that term is in my Amendment; but I would say that an important Bill is a Bill that a majority of this Body feels should be given a great deal of time to. There are some Committees, and I was on a Committee, Insurance Committee, last week that we spent an hour talking about a Bill. And we defeated it 18 to 0. Now, we can afford to do that at this time of the year;



but I think that Committees as a whole should have the prerogative of setting priorities on the Bills that they're going to spend time hearing. And not just because a Bill is introduced, some of them don't deserve to be heard because there are other more important Bills that should be heard. And that determination should be made by Committees as a whole."

Yourell: "Well, I have to disagree because I don't think that an im . . . the importance of a Bill can be determined by a Committee of three. And I think that many Bills that we thought were insignificant through the years have become through their application and their implication very important pieces of legislation that have directed the course of state government through the years. And so I don't want anybody to tell me that a Bill that I might have is not important and doesn't deserve the consideration that other Bills might attract. And so if we can't define and bring to definition the word 'importance' as far as it relates to the Bills that are introduced, I think the Bills that are introduced are important to each and every Member or they wouldn't introduce them. And to have a restriction on the number of Bills and predicated . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jim Houlihan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, excuse me, Representative Yourell; but this is a point of order. I don't believe that the Amendment deals in any fashion with important Bills."

Yourell: "Well, only in the sense that the Sponsor of the Amendment mentions that word 'importance', the importance of the Bill to determine whether it is assigned to Committee or can get out of that Committee as a number of Bills assigned to that Committee that week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the speakers





said that the people of this state deserve to be represented and that everybody should be able to have a Bill heard. I would submit that with 4,000 Bills introduced, and with Committee hearings in which there are 100 and 150 Bills posted, that nobody gets represented. And I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. I think the 'nos' have it. The Gentleman's motion fails and we do not adopt Amendment #3. Amendment #4."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Telcser, amends House Bill 94 by striking Rule 14(c) and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser . . . Representative . . ."

Telcser: "Mr. . . . hey, where's my . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Representative Collins . . . Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. I had my light on on that last Amendment before Mr. Kane got up. Now, I know my name is down in a difficult place for you to find; but would you please . . . I know if I went to another school it might be easier to find me."

Speaker Redmond: "You'd be more important if you did, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "That shows how effective he is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser on Amendment #4."

Telcser: ". . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Resolution 94 provides for the formation of a new Committee, called the Committee on State Government Organization, to which matters dealing with the reorganization of state government would be referred. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel very strongly that this should be a bipartisan Committee since it is in fact a select Committee, a unique Committee, one which was just created, and one which I doubt will exist after the completion of this Session. The rules do not state the make-up of the Membership of this Committee. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 to House Resolution 94 provides that the Membership of this Committee would be bipartisan. That is, there would be an equal number of Members of both parties to be appointed to this



particular Committee, as is the case in many other states dealing with reorganization of state government. I know that the Speaker and the Majority and the Members of the other side of the aisle do not and will not necessarily consider this reorganization matter a partisan one because as someone's told me earlier today the tide ebbs and flows, things go up and down. Sometimes the Republicans are in power, sometimes the Democrats. And I think all of us want to do what's right for the state generally, and for the people generally, and not make political partisan considerations regarding this type of matter. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the reason for the offering of Amendment #4, to insure that the reorganization of state government, which will affect all people in the State of Illinois and all parties, regardless of who is going to be the Governor now or later, ought to be a bipartisan Committee made up of equal Members of Republicans and Democrats. And, Mr. Speaker, I now move and offer the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are the House of Representatives, we represent the people. They elect as many of either party as they desire to do so. This Committee is not treated any differently under the rules than any other Committee. It is a representative Committee, representative of the composition of this House. I do recall a few years back when the distinguished Gentleman from Chicago was in the Majority. I did not then hear any speeches about equal numbers on Committees. It comes with bad grace to come at this point as a matter of fact, though, and in all seriousness we are trying to treat this Committee in the same way that all other Committees are treated. Republicans have fair representation on those Committees, Democrats have fair representation, the people made the decision. If the composition of this House changes, the Committees will change. And for that reason, this proposal should be voted down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the . . . would the Sponsor of the Amendment . . . would he yield for a question?"



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Wolf: "Representative Telcser, is this the same as the . . . like the 'Krueger' Commission type of a thing?"

Telcser: "It is in my judgment, Representative Wolf. And I'm glad you asked that question. And I'm glad you asked that question. I'm sorry that the Gentleman from Cook says I come with ill grace. This indeed is a nonpartisan, it ought to be nonpartisan. And had the same tone as the 'Krueger' Commission did have."

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

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, well could I address myself to the Amendment, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "I would like to voice my opinion in favor of this Amendment. I did have the pleasure of serving on the Commission on the organization of General Assembly some time back. If there's any Commission or Committee in this General Assembly that should be bipartisan in nature, this should be it. And I would strongly urge the adoption of Representative Telcser's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matijeich: "Representative Telcser, I'd like to get your answer on the record so I'm asking you quite early, you believe that matters of such importance ought to be bipartisan. I can think of nothing more important . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Matijeich: ". . . I can think of nothing more important, for example, than the matter of reapportionment. Let's say for the record now, do you think a Reapportionment Committee ought to be bipartisan?"

Telcser: "Representative Matijeich, I . . . my memory could be wrong, but as I recall, the Reapportionment Commission has bipartisan Membership. The Leaders of the House and the Senate, Minority and Majority, each appoint someone to serve on the Commission . . ."

Matijeich: "Wait, you didn't . . ."

Telcser: ". . . wait a second . . ."



Matijeich: ". . . Committee, not Commission, Committee."

Telcser: ". . . now, let me finish . . . you asked me a question, I'd like to answer that. The 1970 Constitution, the Constitution which many of us support, and we have . . . let me finish . . . and we have a former delegate sitting in this Chamber tonight, provided for the same thing I'm asking for in this Commission, in this Committee that is bipartisan Membership on matters like this. And you know and I know that the Reapportionment Commission is bipartisan . . ."

Matijeich: "Well, you didn't . . ."

Telcser: ". . . Now, the Committee to which you refer in the past has been a standing Committee, a standing Committee; the Committee which we're referring to now is not a standing Committee. It can best be described as a select Committee. It ought to be bipartisan just as the Reapportionment Commission is today."

Matijeich: ". . . Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to talk briefly."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Matijeich: "The Reapportionment Committee is a standing Committee for that Session while we study the matter of reapportionment. And the fact is that this leader at that time was for a Reapportionment Committee that would reflect the Membership of the House. There's nothing more important than reapportionment. After all, that goes into the whole matter of a legislative process. The fact is that he is being one who now stand for equality because it would best serve the interests of the Republican Party. He is being as partisan as one can get. And I say to the Members of this side of the aisle we can be partisan too. Let's take the majority we have and whip this Amendment real quickly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let me point out to you that over 48 percent of the Membership of this House sits on this side of the aisle. And certainly that's about as near 50-50 as you're ever going to get. But if this Amendment does not pass, I think the Committee Membership will probably be 65-35 or 60-40, something like that as the other Committees are made up with a three Democrat majority. That certainly is not fair on a matter of this kind."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt. The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Telcser to close."

Telcser: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I think Representative Matijevec made my point for me. He said, 'let's take our majority and whip this thing'. And that's the tone and the attitude that he and the Members on his side of the aisle want to take and they're going to have to answer to the public in the next election. Now, I know that on that side of the aisle there are many independent-minded Legislators who fought hard for nomination in election who don't feel as you do, Representative; but who recognize . . . who recognize that some matters . . . some matters ought to be nonpartisan. And let me also say to the Gentleman from Cook who spoke before, the Gentleman from Lake, there have been many Resolutions in this House creating Committees, Subcommittees and investigating Committees that were bipartisan. I served on a couple of them. It's not a new idea. It's not an innovation. We've done this many times before, we should do it now. And I hope that those of you on the other side of the aisle who are deeply concerned about the issues and not partisan advantage will vote with me in support of Amendment #4 to House Resolution #94."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #4. Those in favor of the adoption vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Collins, do you seek recognition? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to poll the absentees first, then if there are . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees . . . bit earlier someone asked for an estimate of when we're liable to be through tonight. I have figured out the average time on the Amendments thus far and it looks like it's going to take us eight hours. So you add eight hours to 7:30 and



you arrive at your own answer, and that's bipartisan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson . . . Anderson, Bradley, Darrow . . . Darrow wants to vote 'no' . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . Corneal Davis, Ebbesen, Ewell . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . Hoffman, Emil Jones, McAvoy, Mugalian, Reed . . ."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote. I wonder if I might explain my change?"

Speaker Redmond: "Sneak into it, Jesse."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I listened to Representative Friedrich talk about the percentage break . . . breakdown in the House as Republicans against Democrats, and I did a quick calculation and determine that we have 53 percent Democrats and 47 percent Republicans; and if we had a select Committee of 13 Members, 6 . . . 6 or 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans, it would be exactly 53 percent versus 47 percent. And I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones. He requests to be voted as 'no'. Representative Reed."

Reed: "Vote me 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote Representative Reed 'aye'. Representative J. J. Wolf, do you . . . what do they have, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "80 'ayes' and 90 'nos'."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 80 'aye' and 90 'no'. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "As much as I regret, Mr. Speaker, since Madison changed his vote, I guess we can't get enough. And I'll withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has withdrawn his request for verification. On this question there's 80 'aye' and . . . what was the 'no'? . . ."

Clerk O'Brien: "90 'no'."



Speaker Redmond: ". . . 90 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. The Amendment is not adopted. Amendment #5."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Walsh, amends House Resolution 94 on page 29 by striking line 26 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. The Parliamentarian has indicated that there might be an error on the . . ."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a request that leave be given to amend Amendment #5 on its face in the following way. On line 2 insert 'page 31' instead of '29'; on line 3 insert 'line 6' instead of line '26'; and on line 4 insert 'in line 7' instead of 'in line 27'."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Any objections? Hearing none, the Clerk will make the corrections on the face. Now, Representative Walsh, proceed."

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #5 does to the rules what I think most people thought the rules did in the first place. It provides that any investigation authorized by this House require a vote of 89 Members of this House. Now, the rules currently are that an investigation requiring the Legislative Investigating Commission, the Auditor General or a House Committee or the creation of a special House Committee requires 89 votes. But there are, as you know, other types of investigations that can be authorized. And it's my view that they, too, should require 89 votes. So I move the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Gentleman's proposal is sound and sensible; and I would urge support of the proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Any discussion? Motion's on the Gentleman's . . . the question is on the Gentleman's . . . Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I don't know if I'm in the same Assembly; but I can't . . . I can't help but be stunned by what I just heard. Walsh and Katz together, that's a new law firm."

Speaker Redmond: "One of them isn't licensed. The question's on the Gentleman's motion to the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries."



And Amendment #5 is adopted. #6."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 31 by deleting lines 33 and 34 and inserting in lieu, thereof, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

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

Amendment 6 seeks to change the number necessary to adopt a proposed Constitutional Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, that would be Rule 42. In the Seventy-Seventh General Assembly the rule was 89 votes according to the rules adopted by that General Assembly. And the 26th Amendment to the United States Constitution was in fact adopted under an 89 rule. I might tell you that the Constitution of Illinois of 1970 suggested that . . . well, not suggested, stated that there should be a three-fifths vote on Constitutional Amendments. In a case . . . in three separate opinions the Attorney General of Illinois, William Scott, has stated that that provision . . . that constitutional provision does not bind the General Assembly. That it is our rules, and our rules alone, that determine whether there shall be 107 or 89 votes. We have in the past a tradition of 89 vote. It is only in the Seventy-Eighth and Seventy-Ninth General Assembly that we went to 107. There are many, many Constitutional Amendments. Obviously, there are those who say this is for the Equal Rights Amendment; but it is for all of the Constitutional Amendments that will be coming, some that I will disagree with, some that I will vote against that I've seen offered and are being spoken of today. I think that I might tell you also that after the Attorney General's decision, 'Dyer versus Blair' was heard in the Federal District Court in the seventh . . . in this circuit; and then appealed to the Seventh District. The Seventh District agreed, agreed indeed, that this Body had a right to determine the number that would be necessary to pass and to adopt a Constitutional Amendment. That the Illinois Constitution was powerless to set a number, whether it was 89 or 107. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is probably one of the most significant votes that we'll be casting in changing the rules. I ask that we change the rule to allow 89 votes





under Rule 42 of the rules. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

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

One of the arguments that I have heard repeatedly, I should say, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in opposition to this Amendment, and would request that I be permitted to address myself to the question, one of the arguments that we hear repeatedly in favor of changing our rules is the fact that some other states require only a majority or a majority of those present and voting. It does not seem to me, my colleagues, that this proves a thing, except that that is what some other states do. As a matter of fact, it may very well prove them to be wrong as more and more states seek to rescind action already taking . . . taken by them in passing the E.R.A. As you know, a Federal court has upheld the three-fifths majority rule of the Illinois House and Senate. And this is holding consistent with the United States Constitution which recognizes more than a majority in several places. It does specify two-thirds of both Houses to propose Amendments. It requires three-quarters majority of the State Legislators for ratification. The United States Supreme Court has upheld the right of various bodies to require more than a majority vote on particular issues. In West Virginia it upheld a three-fifths requirement to incur bonded indebtedness, stating there is nothing in the language of the Constitution or history or are cases that require a majority always prevail in every case. Other cases could be cited; but we're included in a memo which some of us distributed to the House the other day. The central point is this, amending the Federal Charter should be . . . should never be done casually, nor should it be done under duress or inflamed passion. Safeguards and caution are required, especially when an issue is emotionally charged. Let's not change this rule simply because one measure has had tough sledding. And we all know that that's what this is all about. Simply because we are in a critical stage of a volatile and highly emotional issue. This constitutes no reason for changing our rules, for lowering the threshold of good judgment, for setting aside the safeguards and disciplines involved in our three-fifths rule. I would urge you,



my colleagues, to think long and hard because once we take action of this kind it will be difficult to undo. I urge you to consider this carefully, to consider the safeguards involved in this extra requirement of three-fifths. There is a reason for it. It is consistent with everything that our founding fathers had in mind when they wrote the original charter. And I would urge you to vote 'no' on Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jesse Madison."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; in the judgment of the Chair, the motion carries. Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman: "I think that perhaps this is an issue that should have been debated. I think that the cutting off of debate may not be in the best tradition of this Body or of any deliberative body. But in any event, I think that I must answer Mr. Hudson's comment. There is nothing sacred about 107 or 89; and it was the very people who opposed it that changed the rules from 100 . . . from 89 to 107, when the General Assembly was . . . rules were adopted. So that it was not the Sponsors or the advocates of the Equal Rights Amendment that changed the ground rules; rather it was those who oppose it. But that's really immaterial. The point of it is that the courts have said that this Body and this Body alone will judge the number of votes necessary. I think that 89 is a proper number. I think that if you count the votes you will find that the Constitution of the United States originally would not have been approved had a three-fifths vote been allowed in the General Assemblies of the then colonies. The issue obviously will be debated in the moments of explanation of vote; and I leave it to you then. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #6. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Cunningham to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, paraphrasing the memorable line that Congressman Simon used after he



was snookered five years ago in the primary race here in Illinois, I don't think that the proponents of E.R.A. should covet the prize so much that they're willing to corrupt the rules of the game. And that's what they're doing in this instance. A more prideless gesture could never be imagined. Back years ago when E.R.A. was a fresh new idea, before it became a tired old football for politicians to pass around trying to get I imagine political yardage, I was amazed as I am sure you were when they first went to court. I thought they would abandon it. I say to you without fear of contradiction later, the proponents of E.R.A. will be prouder tomorrow if they stand up to win, rather than to slip under the backdoor. So vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

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

I rise to explain my vote and tell you that I support very strongly the Amendment #6 to change the rules back to a simple majority. Two weeks ago we sent to you, those of us . . . four of us who served in the Constitutional Convention, Representative Madigan, Representative Willer, myself and Representative Dunn, a sheet telling you why we supported this change. We cited the Federal District Court opinion that said that the rules lay in the power of the Leadership of both the House and the Senate. That was a three-judge panel who in a Federal court that put down that opinion. Three times the Attorney General of this state has given the same opinion. This issue was so controversial in the Constitutional Convention that in Section 4, Article XIV, the last sentence of that Section reads, 'The requirement of this Section shall be given . . . shall govern to the extent that they are not inconsistent with the requirements established by the United States'. I think that a Federal court decision, the Attorney General's decision have proved that it is indeed does contravene the Constitutional Convention or the Constitution of the United States. I would also like to point out that since the time that Illinois became a part of the Union in 1818 that the Illinois Legislature has ratified 13 Federal Constitutional Amendments with a recorded vote. The 20th Amendment apparently was adopted by a voice vote, the 21st was adopted by Convention, the 13th, 16th and



22nd Amendments would not have been ratified because the Illinois House vote would have been insufficient under the three-fifths rule. The 17th and 24th, the Child Labor Amendments would not have been ratified since the Senate vote would have been insufficient. The 18th Amendment would not have been ratified since the vote in both Houses would have been insufficient. The Slavery Amendment would not have been ratified. I think that it is proof enough that a three-judge Federal court opinion and that the Attorney General have spoken. I have been unwilling to change this Section of the new Constitution until it was tested. I believe as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention that that Section has indeed been tested. And I would urge you to join me in returning the requirement back to a simple majority."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. My view of constitutional revision is that whether it be at the Federal level or at the state level constitutional revision should not be accomplished easily. We should provide that Amendments to a Constitution are given great consideration and are taken through a good deliberative process. We have established that in the case of an Amendment to the Federal Constitution that two-thirds of both Houses of the Congress report favorably on the Amendment or Resolution. And that then that Resolution be ratified by three-fourths of the States of this Union in whatever way they choose to express their voice on ratification. I feel that that process provides sufficient protection against those who would change or alter a Constitution without due consideration and deliberation. And to provide for more stringent requirements would unduly burden the efficient, intelligent adaption of government to change. It is for those reasons that I am voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate your calling me after the last distinguished Gentleman because I think I want to approach this subject from the same angle that he did. I'm getting a little tired of having every vote or almost every vote I cast on



almost every issue tied in with E.R.A. I'm a little tired of the subject, and I think we ought to do everything we can to take a vote on it and get it out of here. But I think what I'd like to remind the Members of this Body is that there are other Federal Amendments which are being proposed. I, for one, oppose one of those Constitutional Amendments which is being considered in the Congress. And in considering how to vote on this particular Amendment, I took into consideration my opposition to that proposal that is being discussed. But I think each one of us was elected by our constituents to come down here and vote. And because I'm going to be opposed to a future Amendment doesn't mean that somebody has to go out and get two votes to counteract my one opposition vote. I think that the protection that Representative Madigan has spoken about is built into the whole ratification process. And I don't think that our constituents ought to be made to suffer on any particular vote because we're for or against a proposed Constitutional Amendment. I'm sick and tired of E.R.A. being brought into this. I think there are things in the future we've got to look to and we've got to make up our minds on the basis of how we feel we're elected. And if you believe in one man-one vote, and I use that term generically, if you believe in one man-one vote the way to vote is in favor of this particular Amendment.

Speaker Radmond: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To expand just a little bit on what the previous two speakers have pointed out, I would just like to remind the Members that there . . . as has been pointed out there will be other Constitutional Amendments coming before this Body, one of which is likely to be the Human Life Amendment. And those who are voting red in great measure are likely to be in support of the Human Life Amendment. And I think they should be aware that what they are doing is requiring a three-fifths majority not only for the E.R.A., but for the Human Life Amendment and for any other Constitutional Amendment that comes along. We better think about that before we make a final decision right here."

Speaker Radmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a number of Members



have spoken for this Amendment and suggested an unusual majority where it should never be had. Well, let me point out to you that the Federal Constitution itself says that when the Congress shall propose Amendments it takes an unusual majority, it takes three-fourths of the state to ratify it. Why didn't they say a simple majority if that's . . . if they didn't think it should be an unusual majority. I would remind you, too, that I was one of the delegates at the Constitutional Convention, and this Section . . . Article XIV, Section 4, was debated long and loud. It was not passed over lightly. And I can assure you that the Constitution of Illinois, which you swore to uphold, says that it takes a three-fifths majority. Now, how can you be in this Body and having taken an oath to support the Constitution, then change the rule that says it takes . . . it doesn't . . . you won't support it! I think that Constitution changing should be done very deliberately. It should be done not casually with a simple vote as it has been done in some other states. And if you'll look at the debates in some of the other states, I can assure you that it was not deliberative. I hope that the State of Illinois continues to be a deliberative Body. And I think you ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know how many of you saw 'Roots'; but one of the distinguished Lady's in the . . . this argument a few minutes ago mentioned the fact that the 13th Amendment would not have been adopted if it required more than a majority. A simple . . . it was a simple majority that gave us the 13th Amendment; and it was a simple majority that brought freedom to my grandfather. You see I'm old enough to tell you that I knew my grandfather. That I was 17 years old when he packed. How could I stand here now and vote any other way. And now in the light of what you saw in 'Roots', I believe all of you, I know most of you I think saw it, I believe all of you would agree that the 13th Amendment was godsend. And let me say this to my churchmen, a lot of churchmen, in church the other day and the man was talking about women . . ."



Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please."

Davis: ". . . let me say this to the churchman, and we go on to prayer, we're going to have a prayer meeting in the morning, I expect you to be there, I want to say this to you, if God calls the woman . . . if God calls the woman to preach the same as he calls the man to preach, why don't you let that woman answer him? I propose that question to you. You know the Galatians was a fickle-minded people and St. Paul had to write a letter to them and tell them that neither male nor female in the sight of God. They wanted to know what was going to happen in Heaven, neither male nor female. And I say to you it looks like some of you want to require even now more to free a woman than to free a man. I say to you, I plead with you with all the sincerity in me to vote 'aye' on Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be at the prayer breakfast tomorrow morning too. And we may have a conflict of prayer over this subject or . . . I want to say I, briefly I asked the Illinois Legislative Council to provide me with a report of all of the instances in our Illinois Constitution where those who drafted the Constitution thought that extraordinary subjects were considered and an extraordinary vote ought to be required. There are actually 18 provisions. We're not picking on Federal Constitutional Amendments. There are 18 different instances in our Illinois Constitution where the drafters thought it was important enough to require an extraordinary vote. We need a three-fifths vote to override the veto of a Bill, three-fifths vote to override an item veto, a three-fifths vote to initiate branch banking. We can go on and on and on through all these different subjects. It seems to me that the United States Constitution, the Constitution of our land is . . . least as important as these 17 other subjects. And lastly I would say that all of the Members who were standing and sitting here this evening took an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And the Constitution of the State of Illinois includes the express and clear language that a three-fifths majority shall be required for ratifying Amendments to the Constitution of the



United States. I didn't hear anybody say that they were taking that oath of office with mental reservations about commas, or apostrophes, or paragraphs, or provisions or anything else. I think we all took an oath to support this Constitution. And I'm pleased to see the majority are continuing to support every express provision of our Illinois Constitution. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Thank you, Mr. . . . thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hear over, and over and over from the opponents of this particular Amendment one thing loud and clear, we in Illinois possess superior wisdom to the rest of the United States of America because we are the only state to require this unusual majority for amending our Federal Constitution. The previous speaker speaks about our Constitution, our State Constitution requiring a three-fifths votes on various matters dealing with state government. How we choose to handle our own state affairs is our business; and if we want nine-tenths, that's our business. We are now speaking about the Federal Constitution. We are imposing our will upon 49 other states by mandating this unusual majority. I remember in Con-Con . . . Mr. Speaker, may I have . . . I remember in Con-Con asking my seatmate, who is a very learned lawyer, why they were proposing this three-fifths. And I'm happy to say I thought it was a pretty dumb idea and that's what I said at the time. And I said then, 'Who were we to be so different from the 40 and other states?' I don't think God endowed us with wisdom superior to the rest of the country. I think we have a large dose of arrogance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would strongly urge you to consider your vote on this Amendment. And join us who are supporting this change. Now, there's been talk here about we took an oath of office to support the Constitution. Well, I took that oath of office, and I very strongly want to let you know that I intend to support the Constitution of the State of Illinois. But this question has already been decided by the Court of Appeals of the Seventh Circuit. And they have said that we in this Body here are the ones who determine our rules. And, therefore, we are





supporting the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And let me tell you this, I feel very strong about supporting the Constitution of the United States. And I've heard a lot of talk here today about what our forefathers have done in the provisions that they have put in here. But don't forget this, if they had the rule of the three-fifths we wouldn't have a Constitution of the United States because only eight of the nine states would have approved it. So we are supporting the Constitution of the United States, we're supporting the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And remember what you're doing here today is for every other Constitutional Amendment that will come up. So consider this strongly, and then when you . . . when E.R.A. comes up you can vote on that; but let's have a fair rule. And I urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think everybody's made an argument pro and con; but there's only one argument I want to leave with this Assembly. The Federal Constitution provides that all of us who are Members of this General Assembly have to take an oath to the Federal Constitution, Article VI of the Federal Constitution. Now, the courts also decided for a three-man panel in the Federal Courts of Illinois, that the power of the State Legislature to ratify an Amendment to the Federal Constitution is derived from the Constitution of the United States. When you take an oath to become a Legislator you also took an oath to observe and uphold the Constitution of the United States. By virtue of the Supreme . . . Supremacy Clause in Article VI of the Federal Constitution the court said . . . 'in the District Court it is clear that the Legislature's ratifying function may not be abridged by a state'. And further on, 'that the function of a State Legislature in ratifying the proposed Amendment to the Federal Constitution', like the function of Congress, 'if proposing an Amendment is a Federal function derived from the Federal Constitution and it transcends any limitations thought to be imposed by the people of a state'. I submit, therefore, that although I took an oath to support the Constitution of Illinois, my primary oath is to the Federal Constitution of America because that's



the one from which the Illinois Constitution to derive its power. And the case just cited by my friend from DuPage said bonding power not a Federal Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 66 'aye' and 100 'no'; and the motion fails. #7."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Bowman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 29, line 15, by deleting 'and receives at least 70 affirmative votes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman . . . Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that's a tough act to follow. The Amendment that I propose to House Resolution 94 retains the present provision of the temporary rules. It would carry over into the Eightieth General Assembly, that is, any Member of this Body . . . any Member of this Body would have the right to request Postponed Consideration of his Bill if it failed to get 89 votes from the first try . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison . . . Representative Matijevecich."

Matijevecich: "Mr. Speaker, I was only going to rise . . . I didn't see Harold Katz here, but he's here so he can handle it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Rules Committee decided after considering the amount of floor time that is involved in the full consideration of a Bill to put in a requirement that a Member could put a Bill on Postponed Consideration but only if the Member got 70 votes. The feeling was that if a Member cannot get 70 votes on a proposition that it is not really anything that is going to fly; and that since several hours can be involved in a duplicate debate on the same matter that was fully debated the first time, that it would save the time of the House to do that only where there is a realistic opportunity for the Member to adopt and pass his Bill the second time. 70 votes is still 19 votes short of enough; but if the Member had less than 70 votes, the feeling was that while the Member may feel strongly about it, and his district may feel strongly about it, that if the House has heard that Member fully once, has given everybody a chance to participate, and



if after hearing all the arguments, the House only gives him 45, or 55 or even 65 votes that there has been a full consideration of the matter. And we should not have to reenact it. For that reason, the Rules Committee did insert the 70 minimum vote on Postponed Consideration. And we would, therefore, oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of Representative Bowman's Amendment. Many times early in the morning we have Bills here later in the Session, there'll not be enough people on the floor to even get 70 votes, although we're in Session, and I think sometimes a measure that can be explained in a more logical manner will then pass after some Postponed Consideration. And I know this happened several times in the past, and Bills end up passing with a large number of votes. And I think this is an unfair requirement while it might possibly speed up the House. And I do think it gives an issue a chance to discuss it, and straighten it out, and give it another life. And I would urge defeat of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to Representative Katz's point, I would like to say that I, too, think that only Bills which have a reasonable chance of passing should be placed on Postponed Consideration. But I believe that the . . . rather than adopting an arbitrary number, the Sponsor of the Bill is the best person to make the determination about whether it has a reasonable chance of passing or not. I would point out that it is possible . . . if the House Resolution passes without this Amendment, it would be possible for a Bill to get a majority of votes passed without necessarily reaching 89, let alone . . . 70, let alone 89 votes. That is vote . . . 68 votes in favor, 60 votes opposed. The Bill clearly under



those circumstances would have a reasonable chance of passing if it could be placed on Postponed Consideration. The choice of 70 is a purely arbitrary choice. I think that we should retain the rights of the individual Sponsor to determine what is a reasonable chance of passing. And I urge an affirmative Roll Call on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #7. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' . . . 'nos' have it. Representative Bowman. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The problem with #7 as Representative Bowman has said is that it is purely arbitrary. It does it seems to me also breakdown to the possibility of certain areas of the state being able to regulate the postponement of Bills as well as putting us in a position to extend our day by standing around verifying whether or not there are 70 or enough votes to postpone. So I think that the 70 Rule does is place us in a position of always verifying that Roll Call on an issue. It takes away, finally as you all know, the sense of good judgment that most Members have exercised in the effort to try to give their Bill a greater understanding to some of the Members who on some occasions will misunderstand. And I think we make a serious error in not adopting this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished" Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just to add a couple of words to those already made, which I think are absolutely legitimate. Much depends on when a Bill is called how many votes it gets. If a Bill is called first thing in the morning, Mr. Speaker, there is very good chance that it will not get 70 votes because there are only 70 people here. Or if 70 if it is at all controversial it is uncommon for it to fall short of that. Now, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is another reason why this is not a good idea and that is that if a Bill does not get this arbitrary number, and it is an arbitrary, and the Sponsor sees a way to amend it to satisfy some opponents, and not do irreparable damage to the Bill, he can still do



that. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's being capricious and discriminatory to do this in this arbitrary manner. And I would suggest to you that you vote 'aye' in the interest of fairness."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've had some mixed emotions about this; but I can say from some past experience that often times there is some misunderstanding or misinformation given about a Bill. And if a Member has 50 or 60 votes, sometimes he needs that extra time in that postponement in order to get around and contact his colleagues and clarify the points that might be under question. I think it's a serious mistake for us to take an arbitrary figure of 70 votes plus because many times that has happened. I know Members who have only gotten 30 or 40 votes on a Bill because of some great misunderstanding, gotten the Postponed Consideration on it, and come back and gotten 140 votes on final Roll Call. And I would think that the Members of this House would consider very, very carefully how they're voting on this. And I would urge an affirmative vote."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Considera . . ."

Bowman: ". . . Postponed Consideration, please."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . On this . . . Clerk, Clerk, take the record. On this question there's 63 'aye' and 94 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. #8."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8, Marovitz, amends House Resolution 94 on page 45 by deleting all of line 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #8 deals with one of the most offensive provisions that are in our rules presently. It's a provision that's used to summarily kill a Bill without hearing it on its merits. If you'll read the provisions in the rules, it says that 'A motion to strike the enacting clause takes precedence over a motion to amend'. In other words, if there's a Bill up in this House, and people take the time and consideration to thoughtfully put Amendments . . . propose Amendments



to that Bill, and somebody doesn't want to hear those Amendments, or somebody wants to gut the Bill, they can come in at the very last second or even while an Amendment is being heard, make a motion to strike the enacting clause, and you don't even take up any of those Amendments. You forget about the Amendments, forget about the people who have taken the time and consideration to go to the Reference Bureau and have those Amendments drafted and proposed. That motion to strike the enacting clause takes precedence over everything. And I think this is one of the most undemocratic procedures in the House of Representatives. We have a Committee process; if a Bill gets through the Committee process, I think it deserves to be heard on its merits, up or down. Whoever put the piece of legislation in thought it was important enough to him or her, it probably was important to their district, and I think it deserves to be heard on the merits whether it passes or not. This was used last Session on a couple of occasions on very important issues. Regardless of how you feel on the issue, I think each one of us here as individuals are entitled to have our pieces of legislation heard. And I think this is a very offensive rule. Certainly a motion to strike the enacting clause, first of all, shouldn't even be in our rules; but to take precedence . . . to take precedence over every other Amendment or every other motion is absolutely ridiculous. And I think it's very undemocratic; and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call to get this archaic provision and this offensive provision off of our rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Amendment #8. I think that this Amendment should be defeated. The striking of the enacting clause is a part of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the State Senate since the inception of the legislative process. Part of the congressional process that is available to the Members of Congress as is available to the House of Representatives. Very frankly, it's a very seldom used technique on the floor of the House; but it does save the time of the House of Representatives, a lot of hours of debate and gets right to the substance of very important type legislation. In many



cases the striking of the enacting clause that was used twice last Session on two Bills that were Bills that saved the time of the House of Representatives hours, and hours and hours of deliberation and political rhetoric. And, basically, everybody had their mind made up on the substance of those Bills. And I think to preserve the legislative process and the type of parliamentary procedures that are needed to maintain the House of Representatives and also to allow the flexibility of the House to get to the substance of a political issue that may be before the House, I think the enacting clause should be maintained and Amendment #8 should be overwhelmingly defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's very evident to me that Representative Simms has not read this Amendment. This Amendment does not do away with the motion to strike the enacting clause. It simply takes away that provision that allows that motion to strike to have precedence on . . . over all of the motions and all of the Amendments. I think it's a good Amendment. I don't agree with the motion to strike; but if you're going to have it, it certainly should not take precedence over everything else that's being considered. And I think it's a good Amendment, and it ought to be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the seven terms that I've had the privilege to serve here very rarely has the offering of an Amendment to an existing Bill, then offered to the General Assembly that would in any way strike or amend the enacting clause. When those motions have been presented to this House, I could assure you in my recollection of the few times that it has happened that those times were of a great significant, momentous moments. Only because generally Committee action allowed a Bill out that on its face was valueless, was completely ridiculous to allow to proceed to a further order of business for debate to take up the time of the House. Now, we have witnessed just today motions to carry out Bills out of Committee when the Bills were not reported out. Well, on the converse side the motion to strike an enacting clause generally has been offered



only when a ridiculous Bill with very little substance being offered to the Membership of this House to debate on the merits, whether it's up or down, and to waste the time of the House that a Member would offer such an Amendment as striking an enacting clause. One of the reasons why it takes precedence, and why it is offered as a . . . in a role of offering as an important measure is because it strikes at the very issue of a deliberative Body and what we want to deliberate. It does not allow a Committee to send out Bills willy-nilly that have no substance for us to waste our time on. Just like when a Committee acts conversely when they don't send out a Bill that we want to act on. To adopt this Amendment would somehow offer hope to some people, I guess, that they somehow could make a bad Bill pass in the Illinois General Assembly. I just don't think it's true. I just don't think that this Amendment really is going to be the answer what some people think that they're going to accomplish by adopting it. I think it's a bad Amendment. I think the provisions allowing the Members of this House to offer a . . . enacting . . . a striking of the enacting clause or any portion of it is a reasonable alternative to a Committee structure that allows out bad Bills that we don't want to debate. I vote . . . I urge a negative vote on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm rising to oppose this Amendment. I have to agree with Representative Simms and Representative Hanahan. I believe that this motion is a useful parliamentary tool that can be used as has been stressed, and I think we should unline it, only rarely and only in the case of a Bill or a matter where Amendments have primarily been . . . have been presented, which will do damage to the Bill, which will gut a Bill, which will impede its passage. And so are designed in that fashion so they will not only . . . they will not only gut the Bill but they will entail a great deal of time in debate and consideration of the Amendments. I think you will find that those who will support such a motion are those usually who have already made up their minds in opposition to the Bill. And it is usually the census of the House that this is a Bill that is not going to pass, and it is a desire to conserve the





time of the House through this parliamentary measure. As Representative Hanahan pointed out, it's rarely used. In my time down here, in my six terms down here, this motion has only prevailed three times. And in every instance it was on matters which were important, important matters, but where the Amendments were designed to either kill or gut the Bill. And so I think in answer to the thrust of this Amendment it's obvious that such a motion must take precedence. It would be rather silly to go through debate on every Amendment that may be offered to a Bill and then consider this parliamentary tactic. If you're going to resort to this type of tactic, it must take precedence, it must be taken up immediately and disposed of either up or down. If this motion fails, which it will more often than not, then you move to . . . you can move on to the Amendments of the Bill. But I think that this is a vital part of our rules, it's a very useful tool rarely employed, and I think one that we are well-advised to retain."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In case the freshmen do not know exactly what a motion to strike the enacting is, on every Bill at the very beginning it says, 'Being enacted'. And if you strike that and everything after that, there is no Bill, there is no substance. Now, one of the Representatives from the other side of the aisle said, 'It's part of our rule'. That doesn't make it right because it's part of our rules. That's why we're here dealing with the rules. I don't think that this kind of a motion should take precedence over other people who have thoughtfully proposed Amendments to improve a Bill. And this is not only used for ridiculous Bills that have little substance, as a previous speaker said, this was used on redistricting, and this was used on the decriminalization of Marijuana Bills. I don't think anybody, no matter how you feel on those issues, would say that those Bills have no substance at all. They've been the subject of editorials, in TV news broadcasts. And I think they have a lot of substance, no matter how you feel on the subject. I think that the Amendments that were introduced on the Decriminalization Bill were Amendments that people thought really might improve the Bill. And, again, you may not agree with it. You may disagree with it.



But at least an individual's got a right to have his or her Bill heard on the merits. And I think it's offensive, it's undemocratic. And if you take a look at it, it definitely should not take precedent. And we're taking this out of the rules so it doesn't take precedence over every other Amendment. And you can't come in at the last minute and say, 'I don't want to consider those Amendments, take mine and take precedence, and kill everybody else's thoughtful Amendment'."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Merely a point of order. I think that some of our colleagues have forgotten that it is against the rules of the House to mention the names of our colleagues in debate. And for me it poses an extremely difficult problem when Simms, Collins and Hanahan agree I have extreme difficulties in voting. So I do hope that you will avoid use of names in the future."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #8. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' . . . those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 52 'aye', 92 'no'; the Gentleman's motion fails. #9."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Marovitz, amends House Resolution 94 on page 6 . . . 26 by adding after line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the reason that the last one went down was because everybody was waiting for this one to vote favorably; but I'm not going to give you a chance. I'm going to table it."

Speaker Redmond: "#9 tabled. #10."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #10, Robinson, amends House Resolution 94 on page 57 by deleting line 8 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, in my first meeting on Elections Committee I was surprised to find that the House has a custom in its rule that the House pays the legal fees for both the challenger and the person being



challenged in election challenges. I feel that this is wrong for a number of reasons. The Speaker has made it clear on a number of occasions that the House is in financial difficulty. I looked back two years ago and saw that the House had paid out over \$36,000 in legal fees in election challenges. I believe that this kind of payment ought to be limited. In the Elections Committee I made a proposal that the Elections Committee cease paying any legal fees. This was not approved, however, I was informed that the proper time to present some kind of limitation would be in the House Rules. The proposal that I have here says essentially that both the challenger and the person being challenged would be responsible for the first \$1,000 in legal fees. And that they would also be responsible for amounts over a limit. That limit would be set by the best judgment of the Elections Committee. This would certainly limit the liability of the House in paying these legal fees. Now, I feel that this is a good Amendment to the rules because I feel that the complete assumption of legal fees by the House can encourage frivolous challenges. I also feel that officials at other levels of government, when they run for Mayor or when they run for other offices, they are responsible for paying their legal fees. I don't think the House, the Legislature, ought to be that different. I also note that if we're challenged as candidates at the Board of Elections or in the court prior to being seated, we're responsible for those legal fees. I don't think that it should be that different just because the challenge occurs after we're sworn in. And, finally, I note that there are many citizens who have trouble paying their legal fees in private court cases, either when they're sued or when they want to bring suit. I don't think that we ought to set the example that we take care of our own in the House while people in our community go without legal attention. And as a matter of fact, \$36,000 would have paid for a legal services program for all of the citizens in need in my county for a year. I ask your approval of this Amendment. I think that it's reasonable. I think that it sets standards that the Elections Committee can meet. It discourages frivolous challenges. And I think it, finally, will help the budget of the House this year during a time



of fiscal crunch. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "There were proposals to the Rules Committee to eliminate the payment of legal fees in connection with challenges. Those proposals were rejected. The Gentleman from Sangamon has come up, however, with a proposal that did not come before the Rules Committee, which was to set a deductible amount so that anyone who did want to challenge would have to put \$1,000 of his or her own money in in order to prevent frivolous challenges or instituting challenges because there might be a friend who would be a lawyer who might like to get legal fees in connection with it. In the form in which the Gentleman from Sangamon has presented it as a deductible amount, it seems like a sensible restraint on the frivolous incurring of legal fees. And I would support the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I must rise to oppose this Amendment to the rules. I think that because of the unique . . . the unique burden invoked upon us by the Constitution that we have to approach this a little differently than one would in a court of law. We are the only office that is . . . is required to determine our own qualifications for seating in this House. And it must be done by Members of this House. I say further beyond that it is the people's business which we are dealing with and it is the people's business to insure that people seated in this House are properly elected and qualified. Not only that, but if we are to . . . if we are to adopt restrictions on the payment of legal fees we have said to that Member who is challenged and who cannot afford legal defenses that he really is out of luck. We have . . . we have cast him adrift of . . . before one who is better able to afford a legal contest. There is no system for him to be provided free legal aid such as the defender system here. So he really is thrown upon the mercy of the court. But I say even beyond that we have had many election contests in our years in this House. I think that I have served on more election contests than any man currently serving in this House. And I know that everyone is different,



everyone has a different set of circumstances, everyone requires a different amount of time and everyone requires a great deal different amounts of effort on the part of individuals and attorneys. So I think that to impose an ironclad rule is really not realistic. And if we're going to say that the Committee must impose maximums, what we're saying to this Committee is that you're going to be asked from time and time again either to remove your maximum or to reduce the amounts the maximum would suggest. I know in cases that have been before Committees upon which I have served we have gone before the Speaker of the House and have made recommendations to him that fees be required that were above the current maximum. In other events, I'm thinking of one in particular I believe it was four years ago, we went to the Speaker of the House and asked him to recommend that legal fees be cut down drastically because we didn't think the . . . the individual's fee . . . or lawyers in question had earned the type of fee that they were requesting. I just don't . . . I don't think it is feasible to have such an ironclad rule as we have . . . as is proposed here. And I think that we do have a rule that does now just exactly what the Gentleman is attempting to do. And if you'll . . . if you'll look at our rules, it says the Committee shall make recommendations to the House concerning reimbursement of attorneys fees and expenses of the parties. It doesn't say we must pay them. It says that we are going to make recommendations concerning those fees. And it does go beyond that to say that such recommendation shall not exceed a sum that is reasonable, just and proper. I think we've covered the whole thing right there. We've done the job as the Gentleman would like to do; and even beyond that, after the Committee recommends, it is up to the full House to adopt or reject that report. I think we have a rule that is all inclusive enough without tying anyone's hands. I . . . a lot of good deal of debate and thought went into this very rule which evolved from the Elections Committee two years ago and was adopted by this . . . the full House. I think we have a good rule. I think we have one that we can live with. And I think that this Amendment should be rejected."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Turn Representative Madigan . . ."



that isn't Madigan, that's Houlihan, D. L."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to join with Representative Collins in opposing this Amendment. The proposed Amendment is simply, I feel, too cumbersome. It seeks first to establish the maximum limitation, then it also establishes a threshold amount, which must first be met before the maximum could even be considered. And then, in addition, it provides in the Amendment that in order to suspend the maximum you must have an extraordinary three-fifths majority. I think as Representative Collins has pointed out the rule has not been abused, and has worked well; and I submit that the standard that is in the rules presently, namely, reasonable, just and proper is an adequate standard. One that is . . . will safeguard and make it broad enough, though, as to all of the peculiar type cases that come up under this rule. In addition, the rule provides that this is a recommendation only. It's a recommendation that must be, first of all, approved by the Committee, which is in the best posture to determine what is reasonable, just and proper. And it also is a recommendation that must be adopted by a majority of this House. I urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Robinson to close."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I'd like to make the point that this Amendment is different than the existing rule because it does set a \$1,000 threshold that makes everyone before they go to make a challenge know that at the very least they're going to have to pay that first \$1,000. I think that that will go a long way toward discouraging frivolous challenges; but it also meets some of the objections that Representative Collins did bring to the Committee, and that's the fact that there may be people who aren't able to pay. And this rule does say, first of all, that it is up to the Committee to set what that limit will be; and, finally, that even when that limit is a hardship on a Member or someone bringing a challenge that the



Committee by a three-fifths vote can change their limit to meet those circumstances. I think that this Amendment will be a sign to people that the House is trying to bring itself into order in its spending. And I think that it will show that we don't want to be placed in a position where we have a welfare system for some of the powerful, but for our citizens who have trouble with legal aid, why that they have free enterprise. And so I ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #10. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the motion is lost. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how many here have lived through a challenge in which the margin has been less than 100 votes. I have; and I want to assure you that you can't really understand what this Amendment would do unless you have won by less than 100 votes and don't have maybe \$1,000 to go hire a lawyer. If I hadn't had a volunteer lawyer in 1966, named 'Stan Nerusus', who knew nothing about election law when he started, I'm not sure I'd be here today which may or may not . . . which may or may not be what Representative Robinson's intentions are. I would suggest that since he is from a marginal district we may be doing him a favor if we defeat this Amendment as it appears we are."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I merely, again, want to express my obvious conflict of interest. And I'll vote my conscience. I can't help but add that I have painfully suffered in the past by virtue of defending some of our colleagues."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 30 . . . 37 'aye' and 90 'no'; the Gentleman's motion fails. #11."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11 amends House Bill . . . or amends House Resolution 94 on page 25, line 26, by deleting '107' and inserting in lieu, thereof, '89'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."



Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The present House . . . the temporary House rules, Mr. Speaker, provides that on a 'do not pass' motion a Bill that is reported out, in order for that Bill to be taken from the Speaker's Table it requires 89 votes. The proposed rules in House Resolution 94 would increase the requirement to an extraordinary majority, Mr. Speaker, namely being 107 votes. It appears to me to be a little ludicrous to require an extraordinary majority to take from the Speaker's Table a Bill that only requires a Constitutional Majority to pass. And, therefore, I would solicit your favorable support of my Amendment that would restore the present requirement of 89 votes to take a Bill from the Speaker's Table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "I heard a good deal said here tonight about strengthening the Committee system. This was a recommendation and proposal as I recall the distinguished Gentleman of . . . from Chicago, Mr. Telcser. Now his argument was that if you have a Committee system, and the Committee has heard a Bill, and the Committee has recommended 'do not pass', that there ought to be some additional votes required to discharge, not really to discharge, it's to take from the Table, the discharge has not changed, but to take it from the Table at that point the Committee has voted 'do not pass' on the Bill. So the Rules Committee believes that the Members wanted to strengthen the Committee system that is the reason for the 107 votes. And accordingly, we would oppose the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Gentleman from Cook is absolutely correct, the prior speaker, that is, regarding this rule change. I would like to also make the point that the Rules Committee in their deliberations left alone the number of votes required to discharge a Committee from consideration of a Bill on a 'do pass' motion that failed, and the Bill is still in possession of the Committee; or a motion to discharge a Committee, which has in its possession a piece of legislation upon which it has not necessarily acted. We were . . . we were going to consider a 107





vote requirement to discharge a Committee under any circumstance; but taking the reasoning which Rep . . . the gentleman from Cook, who proposes this Amendment, as a foundation, the Rules Committee decided not to even attempt to change the vote requirement to discharge a Committee on a 'do pass' motion that failed or from a piece of legislation not yet considered. A 'do not pass' motion I think ought to take an extraordinary number of votes. This has been the case in prior Sessions. The Committee on a 'do not pass' motion acts affirmatively to say, 'We don't want that Bill to pass'. If the Committee does not want to vote and prevail on a 'do not pass' motion, the Committee simply could let a 'do pass' motion fail and leave it be at that. And under those circumstances, a Legislator on the floor, a Sponsor of the Bill, would only need 89 votes to discharge the Committee. I think this indeed does help strengthen the Committee system, which is what we've been concerned with all evening. I think it's a fair piece of legisla . . . a fair rule the way it stands now. in Resolution 94. And while I respect and understand the Gentleman from Cook's thrust behind his Amendment, I do think he's in error. It depends on which side of the issue someone may be on, but the 107 vote requirement on a 'do not pass' motion, in my judgment, is logical and ought to . . . and the Gentleman from Cook's motion to return the number of votes required to 89 ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Madison to close."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the words of the prior speaker really amaze me in terms of him talking about about strengthening the Committee system. And he speaks to the issue of leaving the 89 vote requirement to the discharge Committee. And that is the situation, Mr. Speaker, where the Committee has not even acted on the issue. Now, it would seem to me if we prevailed on his . . . if we followed his logical reasoning, then the motion to discharge Committee more than the motion to take from the Speaker's Table ought



to require an extraordinary majority because in that instance the Committee has not even had a chance to consider the Bill. Now that aside, Mr. Speaker, it just appears to me that if an individual has 89 votes committed to a Bill that is in Committee and that Bill gets a 'do not pass' recommendation in Committee and comes out here on the floor and he's got 89 votes committed to that Bill. But the rule requiring 107 means that 18 Members of this House can rule over what 89 Members want to do. Now, Mr. Speaker, 18 versus 89. Now if you consider that in the light of what we're talking about, that kind of minority rule would make the part-time government in South Africa look like a Sunday school picnic. We're talking about here the question of whether or not 18 people will decide whether or not 89 people can vote on a Bill. Mr. Speaker, that is absolutely ludicrous. If you've got 89 votes to pass a Bill, you ought to have a chance to pass the Bill notwithstanding the actions of the Committee. I would hope that this Body would consider that in light that if a Bill only takes 89 votes to pass there is absolutely no reason why it should take 107 votes to get it to a point where it could be passed. And I request your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #11. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 55 'aye' and 84 'no'; the Gentleman's motion fails. #12."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12 amends House Resolution 94 on page 6, line 16, by deleting 'Resolutions' and inserting in lieu, thereof, 'Resolutions, Second and Third Reading'."

Speaker Redmond: "D. L. Houlihan on Representative Madigan's microphone."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker . . . Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #12 is a very technical Amendment. It simply indicates that in the daily order of business that on Constitutional Resolutions there must be a Second and a Third Reading in the order of business. That's all the Amendment does."

Speaker Redmond: "Any ques . . . question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #12. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye',



opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. 13 . . ."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment . . . Amendment . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . 16 . . . 13."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . Amendment #13, Dan Houlihan, amends House Resolution 94 on page 31, line 15, by inserting 'Or joint' immediately after 'House'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan at Representative Madigan's . . ."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #13 is also in the nature of a technical Amendment. It amends that portion of the rule that provides that any Resolution creating a special House Committee requires 89 affirmative votes to also make the same requirement for a House Joint Committee. And that was not covered in the rule. And that's what the Amendment does. And I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 13. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. #14."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #14, Dan Houlihan, amends House Resolution 94 on page 46, lines 9 and 10, by deleting 'Except for a motion made pursuant to Rule 33(b)'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan on the same microphone."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again a technical Amendment, Amendment #14, simply deletes extraneous language. And that deletion is now necessary in view of the failure here to adopt Amendment #11. And I ask for the adoption of Amendment #14."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. #15."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #15, Katz, amends House Resolution 94 on page 12 by deleting lines 30 through 33 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Amendment #15 just will bring the rules into conformity with the



actual practice. The previous rules required that the Committee Chairman would announce the Bills that were going to be heard the following week. As a practical matter, the Committee Chairman doesn't know at that point what Bills are going to be heard the following week and because it is not possible to follow the rule the rule is simply deleted. There's no opposition to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. 16."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #16, Pullen, amends House Resolution 94 on page 24 by deleting lines 6 through 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Amendment 16 require . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen's microphone on?"

Pullen: ". . . yes . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Pullen: ". . . Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #16 requires that the estimated expenditure or revenue of a fiscal note be printed in the Digest along with the synopsis of the Bill so that Members would know the fiscal impact at the time that they are voting on the Bill. I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz. Katz."

Katz: "The proposal of the distinguished Lady was considered very seriously by the Rules Committee. It proposes to publish in the Digest the dollar estimate and the fiscal note. The Clerk of the House was asked to testify before the Rules Committee on the fiscal notes that are actually filed. They do not, in fact, all have dollar estimates that could be printed in the Legislative Digest. Anyone that wants to see a fiscal note can go to the Clerk's Office and get a copy of it. It is simply impractical and impossible to comply with the proposal and Amendment #16 in the opinion of the Clerk. Anyone who wants to see a copy can go in the Clerk's Office and see one. Some fiscal notes are 50 pages or more long. Accordingly, the Rules Committee after serious consideration of the matter rejected the proposal."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Rarely have I seen a better suggestion. I would even suggest that the Representative who just preceded me would have been on the other side of the issue about three years ago. I would suggest very seriously that the Members vote . . . consider strongly voting for this Amendment. Certainly if they can't put a dollar figure in the fiscal note, the fiscal note is not very good."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Pullen to close."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to point out to the Members of the House and to the distinguished Chairman of the Rules Committee and to the Clerk that the Fiscal Note Act, and to the Members, that the Fiscal Note Act requires that any fiscal note which is filed shall include a reliable estimate of the anticipated change in state expenditures or revenues under its provisions. It is this estimate which is being sought to be published by this rule change, not the entire fiscal note. If fiscal notes which are being filed now do not have this estimate they are not in compliance with the law. And I would suggest by adopting this rule change we would be helping to comply with the Fiscal Note Act."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion to adopt Amendment 16. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 84 'aye' and 52 'no'; and the motion carries and the Amendment's adopted. #17."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #17, Kelly, amends House Resolution 94 on page 43 by deleting lines 10 through 17 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #17 would terminate the explanation of votes by the numbers. During the Seventy-Eighth General Assembly, over 4,000 Bills were introduced. And during the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly, there were over 6,000 Bills sponsored by Members, which places a very unworkable responsibility on this Body to vote intelligently on every matter which comes before us. This proposal would ease this burden, and with the



debatability staying intact every Member would have a protection to have their legislation given full deliberation. I would like to point out that the Senate adopted this particular position four years ago. And it has worked very excellently in the Senate. The workability of the Senate rules certainly gives credibility to my statement that the time allowed for debate would not increase and that the Members would be given a fair hearing on their Bills. I suppose my biggest objection to the present structure is that the rules are not followed as written. The present rule says that each Member has a right to explain their vote for one moment . . . minute. Now, we all know that this rule is constantly abused. It means hours and hours of additional work to every Member of this Body. And I predict from experience that if this Amendment is not adopted you had better be ready to work into the early morning hours like you will tonight during the next several months of this Session. You'd better be prepared to listen to the publicity-seekers who will take advantage at every occasion of this rule . . . under this incumbent rule, regardless if the vote is 17 or 117 to be heard. I ask for your adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

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

I rise in opposition to this Amendment. I think that perhaps the illusions of the Senate should be explained. In the Senate they have a tradition that everyone whose light is on will be called on and will have a right to debate. In this House it's a long time. We would be . . . each one of us who have something to say would have 10 minutes. I think that's not what we want. We have a tradition in this House the debate often takes place, the major part of the debate, takes place in the explanation of votes. I see nothing wrong with that. I think many of us with that time restraint say, 'Okay, one minute, two minutes perhaps', rather than a long debate. I think the explanation of votes is a perfect way of having debate. Let me tell you something, we debated the death penalty issue in the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly, a matter of some seriousness, a matter that many of us want to speak out on. The debate took 17 pages of



testimony in transcripts in the Clerk's Office, 17; 3 pages were on debate, 14 pages were on explanation of vote. What was wrong with that? What terrible thing is wrong with that? It's a matter of expressing ourselves. This is a deliberative Body. I think the idea that I hear from our other Members in debate are important ideas. They mold my opinion. I hope sometimes my opinion will mold theirs. Only if we have an opportunity to express ourselves, only then . . . only then can we intelligently vote. I vote 'no' on this closure measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope the Members are paying attention to this Amendment because if there's any Amendment to the rules that will do some good to cut down on the horrendous crunch of legislation at the end of the Session so that each and every Bill that comes before us on Third Reading can, in fact, receive careful consideration, this is it. Last Session we saw what I considered a very travesty of just a situation which we considered something like 150 votes on one Roll Call without any debate whatsoever on individual Bills. That was perhaps necessitated by the number of Bills that were facing us on Third Reading with a deadline coming up. We certainly can't say that those Bills received careful reasoned analysis. So I think the very example that the Gentleman gave on the Death Penalty Bill that passed out with something like 120 votes on the . . . on the board and people were explaining their votes for 80 percent of the time in which that Bill was considered is a perfect argument in favor of this important Amendment. We want to truly consider each and every Bill comes . . . that comes before us with careful, reasoned consideration. And let's cut out this extraneous discussion after the Assembly has decided to cut off debate and vote on the Bills and take the Bills up or down. I think you will also find that an awful lot of horrible, bad legislation gets passed during the explanation of vote period when it is used mostly for an arm-twisting demonstration, in order to get bad Bills over to the Senate where they're going to get killed. We waste more time in this Assembly on that single explanation of vote than anybody who has never



sat here can imagine. So I certainly urge an 'aye' vote on this most important Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Amendment for one basic reason, Mr. Speaker, although I agree with the spirit of the Sponsor, the fact is we do have 'closure' rule that limits debate. And without the explanation of vote, our ability to voice out our position on any issue really would depend on in what order we are called by the Speaker. And it means simply that if 15 of us have our lights on, and I'm the sixteenth person, and the Speaker happens to look at my light second or third, there are 14 or 15 people who punched their buttons before me who will not get a chance to speak because I move the previous question. I would think if we could do away with that portion then we could also do away with the explanation of vote. But it does give us a chance now where somebody has moved the previous question to at least voice our opinions on a Bill, Mr. Speaker. And for that reason, I would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I reluctantly disagree with my colleague, Representative Leinenweber. I suggest to you that if we eliminate the explanation of votes then we will be very reluctant to vote to close debate. Any motion to present the question, I think, will be fought very long and hard on. And the effect of that will be that people will talk for 10 minutes instead of the one minute to which they're confined on the explanation of votes. Further, Mr. Speaker, there are . . . is a tendency for the Members to stray during a long debate. And the fact of explaining votes brings them back and gives them an opportunity to vote on the question. So I suggest to you that while this is well-intentioned I do not think it will serve his purpose, and I don't think that you can compare favorably this Body with the Senate. As has been pointed out by Representative Greiman, they do not close debate, they have 59 of those fellows talking for 10 minutes instead of explaining their votes. And I suggest to you that we would move the business along a lot faster if we keep the status quo and do not adopt this Amendment."





Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote in opposition to this Amendment. I have seen several very, very important Bills pass when it looked like they were going to fail because those who got up for a minute or two to explain their vote actually did it in a much better way than some of us who were trying to present the Bill. I certainly would like to see this particular privilege continue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison. Representative Madison, do you desire to make that motion?"

Madison: "Reluctantly, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Kelly to close. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "Well, just a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Representative Madison spoke on the matter and then was recongized a second time. Evidently, you're willing to recognize another Member twice before you'll recognize me."

Speaker Redmond: "That's a good idea. Representative Collins. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "I would just like to close by asking the Members of this Body a question. Would you like to give full consideration to a handful of Bills or almost superior consideration to every Bill? Remember the Bills that are not fairly considered by the end of this Session can very well be your Bill. And I ask for a favorable support on this proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no' . . . those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Madison to explain his vote. Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Sponsor of this Amendment has a very good idea, at least a germ of a very good idea. He might consider putting in another Amendment that would have just explanation of vote and



no debate. I think we might save even more time."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this vote is so close I think we ought to give Representative Kelly the opportunity to explain his vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? On this question . . . the Clerk will take the record. There's 39 'aye' and 109 'no'; and the motion fails. 18."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #18, Matijevec, amends House Resolution 94 on page 9 by inserting after line 26 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentle . . . Gentlemen of the House, simply stated this Amendment #18 would prohibit anybody in Leadership from being a Member of a Commission or a Joint Committee which was created by a Joint Resolution. I'm one who believes that all the brains in the House don't sit in the Leadership. They're not all in the Chairmanship. I believe in the 'Spoil System', but I think it ought to be spread. I frankly believe for example that a Chairman of a Committee should not be a Chairman of another type of a Committee. I think there's enough good talent on the floor of this House to be spread around to other Members. This isn't pointed to any one individual. I think that if you effect good policy that's the most important thing. And I think we ought to write this into the rules so that we live up to that good policy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion, and I admit a conflict of interest perhaps since I am in the Leadership. But Leaders in this House are also Members, and we also have districts with problems in our districts. There are instances as an example when Representative Merlo, now Senator Merlo, served in this chambers with us, he and I, along with Representative Marovitz and I know Representative Levin today were deeply concerned about the condominium problems which were in our district. So we wound up being Members of the Committee or Commission to look into the problems of condominiums and condominium conversions. Your rule would prevent a Member of the Leadership from serving his or her



district. That's only one instance of what I would consider to be an unfair situation. There are times I recall last Session in the Leadership we had . . . because of sickness of some Members and work-load and time conflicts if a Member of the Standing Committee was ill perhaps for that day or that week we had a Member of the Leadership fill in as a temporary Member of the Standing Committee. We even had a Member of the Leadership because of conflicts serve, I believe for the whole Session. While I understand where you're coming from which is a current . . . you say . . . I don't think it's fair, Representative. I don't really think this is what you want to do. And so I oppose Amendment #18 to House Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Well, I understand Representative Telcser's position there. However, let's face it, Representative Telcser, in your position of Leadership you can attend those . . . any type of Committee meeting. You can . . . you can in your position actually discuss anything in those types of Committees. We really have a problem. Let's face it, we've got a Member of Leadership who not only is a Member of a Commission, but is a Chairman, I believe, of two . . . three Commissions . . . two Commissions and one Committee. I don't think that's fair to the other Members. We have a Chairman of a Committee who is also a Chairman of two other Committees. I don't think that's fair to the other Members of the Committee. I am one who believes that as I said that we have enough talent here that it can be spread around. I believe that very firmly. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Peters, do you seek recognition over there? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 48 'ayes' and 72 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. 19."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #19, Matijevich, amends House Resolution 94 on page 6, line 7, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."



Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment would delete the Congratulatory . . . Congratulatory and Death Resolutions, except Death Resolutions pertaining to Members of the House or former Members and Constitutional officers of the state. I think we waste a lot of time. We take advantage of the taxpayer by these fancy Resolutions that we pass out and make a lot of political hay with at the expense of taxpayers. And I would urge the passage of Amendment #19."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the motion . . . in the opinion of the Chair, the motion fails. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this matter was brought up before the Rules Committee. And it was pointed out to the fact that this proposal would prohibit the Congratulatory and Death Resolutions, except Death Resolutions of former Members. And as you know every day there are Members that come up and ask for Eagle Scouts and Boy Scouts in their respective districts. And, in turn, I think that it's the prerogative of the Membership of this House to go into the respective areas and show that, yes, we are concerned about the youth in our community, we are concerned about the people that have participated in government in this state for a good number of years. And the least we can do is put their names in the records of the State of Illinois with a Congratulatory Resolution and saying, 'Yes, we appreciate the fact that you have participated in this state in many different capacities'. I would hope that this House in its wisdom would defeat this Resolution . . . this Amendment to the rules in prohibiting that the Congratulatory Resolutions be eliminated. I would hope . . . I would hope that you would kindly reflect the true concern of your district and vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was considered in the Rules Committee. The fact is that it was felt that there are occasions when Members do use Congratulatory Resolutions without any



harm to the Legislature and with great benefit to Members of the General Assembly. As it has now been set up, the way the Resolutions are read they do not take any significant amount of floor time. There has not been any abuse of the situation and it was felt that it has worked to the advantage of the General Assembly and the Members. And for that reason, the Rules Committee did reject the proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Davis, do you still seek recognition?"

Davis: "No, it looks like . . . it looks we're winning there so I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 68 'aye' and 85 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. 20."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #20, Matijevich, amends House Resolution 94 on page 19, line 31, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Schuneman has a similar Resolution, which is a little better than mine, and it's way down the pike, Amendment #37. So I'll ask leave to table Amendment #20."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table Amendment 20? Hearing no objections, 20 is tabled. 21."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #21, Walsh, amends House Resolution 94 on page 26 by deleting lines 2 through 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I submit to you that the Rules Committee in all of the work that they did slipped up slightly in providing that there would be two ways to adopt Amendments; one by a Committee and the other by floor action. Now, as you know, the temporary rules under which we're acting now, the floor is the only place on Second Reading that an Amendment can be adopted. And I would suggest that that's the way that Amendments should be adopted because for the Committee to adopt an Amendment and not have any floor action would simply cause the Members of that Committee to offer Amendments on Second Reading to undo what they were opposed to in Committee. So I suggest that it's absolutely



no good when the Rules Committee considered that. It will not save any time. And I think that we ought to just provide that Amendments are adopted on Second Reading so that the whole House can, if they want to, debate them. So I offer Amendment #21."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz . . . pardon me, Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Members of the House know that when Mr. Walsh has an intelligent and sensible proposal that I'm right up on my feet accepting it as I did his one a few minutes ago. But this particular one really undercuts the excellent proposal that Representative Kane made. We . . . the Rules Committee took a middle position. Representative Kane did persuade the Members of the Rules Committee that it was desirable to let the Committees function, and that when an Amendment is adopted in Committee that you do not automatically have to readopt it on the floor. On the other hand, the rights of no Members are jeopardized because under the procedure that we will follow, every Committee Amendment that is automatically adopted will be distributed to each Member. And that Member may rise, and the Speaker will recognize that Member to have floor argument and debate with regard to tabling the Amendment that he does not want. So that we will, on the one hand, protect the time of the floor and not waste the Members' time considering, debating and voting on Amendments that have been heard in Committee and on which there is no genuine controversy. But where a Member does have controversy, where he wants to fight the issue that was before the Committee, he will be afforded a simple way of doing it on the floor here. Accordingly, I would urge the rejection of the Members . . . Member Walsh's proposal that would undo the excellent proposal of Representative Kane that is now embodied in the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think Representative Katz has very succinctly stated the issue regarding Amendment #21 to Resolution 94. What is currently in Resolution 94 is the middle ground between the old rules and the chaos to which . . . to which some Members referred earlier and the proposal which Representative



Kane offered earlier. The way the rules currently are it . . . will, in my judgment, speed up the work of the House, help end some of the confusion that we had in the past, and yet not burden the Members with an overly great amount of work in order to keep up with the Amendment process. Representative Katz has explained that Amendments would be adopted in Committee, the Bills would come up reported out of Committee, printed as they were when introduced, the Amendments would be on your desks, which you could read, and it would . . . the burden would then simply shift to the Members who wished to have the Amendments nullified or defeated. And they would have to offer an Amendment to do so. If they didn't take this initiative, the Amendment which was adopted in Committee would stay on the Bill and we would save, as I said earlier, about 80 percent of the time which we have used in the past for the Amendment process in the House. I think the way the rules are now is a step in the right direction. I believe that those Members who supported Representative Kane earlier ought to support the position of Representative Katz and myself and the sincerity with which the Gentleman's motion is put notwithstanding I would urge that the Members of the House vote 'no' on Amendment #21 to House Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I find myself in a rather unusual position here because I'm going to oppose the learned Chairman of the Rules Committee. And I'm also going to oppose the eloquent speaker that has been in the Minority and the Majority Leadership in all of my Membership in this Body. I think that Representative Walsh presents to us an excellent Amendment to these rules. I would submit that many of the newer Members that are here now that you're only having one or two Amendments come across your desks now; but in time to come you will have many Amendments come across your desks, especially Amendments that relate to the fiscal aspects of state government. If you are not familiar with the appropriation process, and the amounts and the determination of the amounts that go in or out of those appropriations and without having full knowledge of those appropriations there's absolutely no



way, unless there is some debate on those Amendments as they are offered on the House floor for Committee adoption, will you have any idea of what has taken place in terms of those Amendments being put on those Bills. Be very careful, very careful about this particular addition to the rules because I think that in protecting the interests of all of the Members here that in this instance the Committee Amendments that are adopted in Committee should be as we have always did in the past, have those Amendments offered on the House floor and adopted here. To simply have those Amendments adopted in Committee, and I find especially in the appropriation process, rarely are Amendments passed there unanimously. There's always opposition involved. And if you think that this is going to speed up the process, it may very well speed the process up, but you may very well lose in the speedup of that process. I think Representative Walsh has an excellent Amendment. And if you're thinking I think you should look down the road, down the line where things aren't going to be as quiet as they are now, you will be thankful that you voted for this Amendment to the rules. I support this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll attempt to be as brief as I can; but I think that before voting on . . . before voting on Amendment #21 you each ought to consider such an aid of a Legislative Article of the 1970 Constitution, which gives to this Body and imposes upon this Body the responsibility of First, Second and Third Reading. Now, the practical effect of this Amendment would be for the full House to delegate to a Committee the Second Reading or amending function. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, practically the effect of this Amendment is to breach, violate the Illinois Constitution. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh to close. You were right the first time. Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing for Representative Schlickman's enemies he urges a 'no' vote, for his friends he urges an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "How about you."

Walsh: "The opposite. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Barnes put





his finger right on this thing with respect to the appropriations process. I think this House is entitled to know what the Bill calls for in terms of appropriations when it reaches Second Reading and to know every change that is proposed. Now, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that mechanically it's not going to make a darn bit of difference. If the Committee adopts an Amendment, and that Amendment is considered adopted, then any opponents to that Amendment in the Committee are going to offer as Amendment #1 the Bill in its original form. So we're not going to save a single bit of time. It's not going to mean a thing from that standpoint. So I suggest to you that the rules as they have been in the time that I've been here, and that is it . . . Amendments are adopted on Second Reading, is a good rule and it should continue. And I urge your adoption of Amendment #1 . . . Amendment #21."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #21. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, another one of the technical problems that would be created is that you are obligated to amend the Bill, you are obligated to amend the Bill as its printed. Everyone here will be drawing up different Amendments to a Bill only to find out at some time later that the Bill has been changed by the Committee. And if you can't then fit all of those things into the framework of it, each and every one of your Amendments possibly could be out of order. I think this Bill does have worthy consideration. And as you may act hastily now, I think you might well regret it a little later."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 52 'aye' and 81 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. 22."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #22, Schlickman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 18 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #22 is a status quo Amendment. It would retain in the rules the 45-day



requirement by which a Bill is to be called in Committee. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems to me the basic elements of the deliberative process are timeliness and predictability. The purpose of this Amend . . . the purpose of this rule is to insure that Members will act expeditiously with respect to their Bills and not to allow them to stay in Committee, towards the end of the Session when that great deluge of Bill consideration takes place. Now, I appreciate that the Amendment or, excuse me, that provision of the rule has been suspended in the past. However, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also feel that anybody who wants to go farther than the 45-day rule should have the burden of asking for leave of the House to suspend that part. Having a deadline of 45 days becomes a standard by which each of us should consider our Bills and extend courtesy to the remainder of the House. So on these bases, Mr. Speaker, that I urge adoption of Amendment #22 to House Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The 45-day rule was put in for the purpose of encouraging Members to file their Bills early. Unfortunately, it has had exactly the opposite effect. The 45-day rule does not begin to run until the Member puts his Bill in, so the Member proceeds to hold his Bill and put it in later. So that rather than encouraging Members to file their Bills early, it encourages Members to keep their Bills in their files and not put them in until the eleventh hour. The fact of the matter is that if the . . . the Amendment of Mr. Schlickman's is adopted, 63 Bills will die in Committee. They will die in Committee, and every one of those 63 Members were precisely the ones who filed their Bills early. And as to the rest of us who are holding our Bills now, and will be filing them between now and the end of this month, we will not have the 45-day rule operating and oppressing us. So that the 45-day rule discourages the early filing of Bills. It is for that reason that the Rules Committee eliminated it. It seems to me that there is nothing that has been said that indicates that the judgment of the Rules Committee was not correct that it is in fact discouraging the early filing of Bills. And it ought to be eliminated. And, hence, we would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I would like . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to incorporate by reverence the remarks of Representative Katz are perfectly accurate. I have had many, many Members come up to me and say, 'Don't be dumb and introduce your Bills early, hang on to them awhile'. And I've had a few Bills caught by the 45-day rule, and so maybe in the future I'll be smart like the rest of you and just wait, and wait and wait. Now, the one problem that perplexes everybody is when the weather gets nice and we get into May and June we're down here until the midnight. And you can't get . . . you can't encourage people to introduce their Bills early because they know if you introduce your Bill early two things are going to happen; you're probably going to get caught by the 45-day rule because the Members don't seem to get in the habit of working, and secondly, they're going to look your Bills over too carefully. And that if you wait, you'll play into the numbers game and you'll be having your Bills considered when there's a big rush, and the weather is lovely and everybody would like to get out. So I think by abolishing the 45-day rule, you'll make it possible for Members to put their Bills in in the winter when we'd just as soon be down here working. We can spread our workload out and avoid that log-jam in the end. So I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in response to the Gentleman from Cook, Chairman of the Commission for the Organization of the General Assembly, either has a faulty or a convenient memory. It was his own Commission that originally recommended the 45-day rule. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the 45-day rule was not intended to encourage early introduction of Bills. The sole purpose for the 45-day rule is to encourage Members once they've introduced the Bill to act on that Bill and to give to the process timeliness and predictability. I suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that a no-nonsense application of the 45-day rule will no one harm, but rather will reinforce the efficient processing of legislation. And I solicit an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 22. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the motion fails. #23."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #23, Schlickman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 29 by deleting lines 8 through 11 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have a status quo Amendment. It would retain the present provisions in the temporary rules that once a Bill hits the Calendar at the Order of Third Reading it shall be called within 30 days. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that serves the House generally and it protects a Member. It serves the House by encouraging the Membership once their Bill . . . have . . . Bills have been reported out of Committee 'do pass' that they call them for Third Reading, the passage stage, rather than allowing a Bill to stay on the Calendar towards the end of the Session when we've got that deluge. The other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is to protect Members. To insure them that within a prescribed period of time that their Bill actually will be called. And it's on these basis, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that I urge your adoption, your favorable considerator of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Katz."

Katz: "With regard to this rule also, it was originally put in with a view to believing that it would speed up the consideration of matters. The way that it is worked out, we have spent a lot of time because later in the Session everything seems near the expiration of the 30-day rule. And, hence, the Speaker is required to call those Bills even though the good conduct of the affairs of the House might indicate that the Speaker would call other matters. It has thus as it has operated been an impediment to the efficient running of the House by the Speaker. It was for that reason that the Rules Committee removed the 30-day rule because it was not carrying out the intent that it originally had thought when it had been put in. Accordingly, we would urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman to close."



Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the no-nonsense application of the 30-day rule would reinforce the efficient processing of legislation. As I said earlier this evening, rules are no better than their administration. Rules are no better than the spirit and discipline by which we adhere to them. I respectfully suggest that this is a good rule. It's one that we have. And I should think that we ought to retain it. I encourage your affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the motion fails. #24."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #24, Schlickman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 42 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a nonsubstantive Amendment. Its effect is simply to codify what fortunately has become a practice in the House. That practice being that no literature, excluding Bills and Amendments or Digests, no literature will be distributed on the floor of the House from the Members' desks without, one, the permission of the Speaker; and two, without identification on the face of the material as to who the distributor the source of the material is. I solicit your affirmative support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matijevich: "Representative Schlickman, I wonder if you could enter the possibility of amending it on its face and just have 'no literature may be distributed on the House floor, period'. Because I think that would be the better way to go. For example, last Session we had that sort of a policy that you had to get the Speaker's permission. And there were all kinds of things distributed anyway. I'd like to live up by the rules. And I had some things I thought as long as everybody else was distributing in violation of that unwritten rule; but I didn't distribute them. We all have offices now. And there's really no reason why we have to have these Pages tripping all over distributing anything on our desks. I think the better policy ought to be no



distribution of anything on our desks. I think it would be more orderly here. We've got our offices, you know; and we know when Bills are coming up. We can distribute anything we want in the . . . through the mail . . . through the House Post Office. And I wonder if you would consider amending that on its face. Not only that, by the way you do it, you put the Speaker on the spot. He's got to practically say 'yes' to anybody anyway or make enemies. And I think the better procedure, if you would consider it, would be putting the period after 'floor'."

Schlickman: "I think about the only response that I can give at this point, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that at this late hour I'm status quo oriented and compromising. I'd like to have something codified which presently exists as a practice."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Schlickman, I might say to you that . . . that the Speaker, I think, shares Mr. Matijevich's view. And if you would amend the rule on its face as Mr. Matijevich has said, you would be carrying out the good rules of the House and the intention of the Speaker. So you may proceed ahead to do so with no objection on our part."

Speaker Redmond: "You are correct. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would ask for leave to amend Amendment #24 on its face by inserting on line 5 after the word 'floor', 'period', and striking everything in the Amendment thereafter."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Clerk is instructed to amend it on its face; and the Speaker thanks you. Representative Schlickman to close."

Schlickman: "I ask for your favorable consideration of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Thank you. 25 . . . thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #25, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 7, line 20, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

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



If you're like I am, you have some nervousness and some trepidation when you push your . . . the switch on the Consent Calendar. I have always . . . well, I should go back and tell you for the freshman who were not here, the previous custom has been, and the previous rule has been, that on the last day of the Session of each week we vote on the Consent Calendar. Generally, in May and in June that's Friday or Saturday. But we know what the last day is and we prepare ourselves. We know, for example, in June that on Friday evening we had best look at that Consent Calendar, see what the Bills are and if there's one that we ought . . . offends us make sure that we cast our vote 'no'. And we ought to make sure that we knock it off the Calendar. We do this and when Saturday comes we act appropriately. The present rule, which has been adopted by the House Rules Committee, provides that we have a four-day period that it stays on the Calendar, any day, on a Tuesday, on a Wednesday, any day. The Consent Calendar which may have 150 Bills on it may be called and you will be caught with your pant . . . with your legislative pants down, I'm afraid. I think all of us will be. I, therefore, recommend that we go back to the old procedure of voting on the last day of the week of each Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Rules Committee did try to expand the use of the Consent Calendar in situations where there was no controversy or contest and we would simply be wasting the time of the Members on the floor. I think that the feeling was that by building in limitations which said that the Consent Calendar could only be considered on the last day of the week, it would mean that Members who had Bills that otherwise might be heard on Monday, for example, and later we will be meeting on Monday and probably through Friday, that it would needlessly be holding up the Consent Calendar. The Consent Calendar was changed to provide that it will still have four days in which the Bills appear in the Calendar. And it was felt that four days was an adequate time for Members to familiarize themselves with the matters that will be going on the Consent Calendar. It is not a matter of historic moment, but it was simply felt that the greater flexibility and the



use of the Consent Calendar would eliminate noncontroversial matters from the floor and, thus, enable us to concentrate in areas where there is real controversy. Accordingly, we would oppose the Amendment, even though we do understand the motivation that has the . . . the Sponsor has indicated. We would urge opposition then to Mr. Greiman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' . . . are you satisfied, Representative Grieman, or do you want a Roll Call? . . . Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 38 'aye' and 81 'no'; and the motion fails. 26."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #26, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 16 by deleting line 31 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try it again. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the prior custom and rule of this House in Committee was to have a majority vote, no matter how many people were there, to get a Bill out of Committee. If a Bill receives a majority, it passed 'do pass' out of Committee. Last spring we adopted a rule that provided for a majority a vote . . . an affirmative vote by a majority of those Members appointed to a Committee. Now, that may seem like an insubstantial change; but I think it was a change . . . a great moment. Right now we sit in Committee, most of our Committees have a full strength; as the May and April approach Members will be out hustling their own Bill . . . appearing before other Committees on their own Bills, perhaps not being in Committee for days and days. And the Committees will, therefore, have sometimes the least productive Members sitting; but they will have great absentees, great, great absentees. I have accordingly suggested a compromise. A compromise between the old majority vote . . . of those voting and the present rule which requires an absolute majority of those appointed. And that is that a Bill will pass out of Committee by one of two ways; either (a) an absolute majority of those Members of the Committee, or





two thirds of those voting on the Bill or Resolution provided that the negative and positive votes must equal a quorum so that we will never have less than a quorum voting. I think it's a good compromise, I recommend it. I ask for your favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "There was a good deal of discussion and some sharp differences of opinion with regards to the question of the 50 percent plus rule that we have under which a majority of the Members of the Committee have to vote for a Bill to come out. It used to not be so. It was adopted last time, as I recall, on the motion of Mr. Matijevich and the motion of Mr. Hanahan. The general feeling and the prevailing view in the Rules Committee was that it has worked well. That it, in fact, require Members to be there. That a majority rule, all things considered, is probably the best way. So I would only tell you that the matter was hotly argued in Committee. Opinion went both ways; but the prevailing view of the Committee was to leave the 50 . . . the requirement of a majority in order to vote a Bill out. In effect, exactly as it had originally been put into the rules on the Mati . . . Matijevich-Hanahan Amendment of the last Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, despite the deliberation of the Committee, I support Amendment #26. Originally when Mr. Hanahan instituted the majority rule, the thought was that this would limit certain Bills from getting out of Committee and spread the Bills over the entire General Assembly consideration. In fact, what it has hap . . . what has happened with the fluidity of Committees is that there are never enough Members in the House in the Committee to get the necessary 13 votes. A Bill is held sometimes in Committee with 11 votes. It makes the necessity of discharging Committee. It holds Bills too long in Committee and they jam up at the end. I think Mr. Greiman has an excellent idea, a kind of a compromise situation which will prevent some . . . will permit some of us from getting our Bills out of specific Committees and to be heard on the House floor without discharge. I commend Mr. Greiman and I very seriously support this Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with Representative Kosinski. I think this is an excellent compromise suggestion. It, first of all, is fair. And there's two basic requirements; one, that you have a quorum present in the total vote; and secondly, that the Bill be approved two to one. Now, if the people who are actually there, and actually listening to the witnesses and actually understand what the substance of the matter is before the Committee constitute a quorum and support it two to one, fair play should call upon us allowing that kind of a Bill to be recommended to the full House for consideration. And I'd urge adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. Stated quite simply what the Amendment proposes is that the requirement for a 'do pass' motion in Committee be less than the requirement on the floor on a motion to pass a Bill. When a Bill is before the House of Representatives on the floor, the requirement is 50 percent plus one of the Body. And today under the proposed rules that's the same requirement that would be applied in a Committee, 50 percent plus one of the Committee. What this Amendment attempts to do is to provide a less stringent requirement for Committee consideration than that which is required on the floor. And then that effect will be that many Bills not deserving of our floor consideration will be approved by a Committee on to meet a certain death on this floor or over in the Senate. Therefore, then that effect is more waste of time, which is one of our real problems in the House of Representatives. As I stated earlier, I oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Amendment is incorrect anyway because a quorum of a Committee has to be one over half. And if you read the last line of Amendment . . . proposed Amendment 26, it says that 'provided that the votes cast must equal a quorum'. Well, if the votes cast must equal the



quorum; then if you have a Committee of 23 people, you need 12 in order to make a quorum. Therefore, it doesn't make it any less than a quorum anyway. So I think this is a superfluous Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Perhaps Representative Greiman would like to speak to that."

Speaker redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "If it were put to me in a question, I would tell you, Mrs. Geo-Karis, that the affirmative and negative added together. So that is quite different. What it requires is that there must be a quorum and that a number which equals the quorum must vote one way or the other on the . . . on the matter. So that it is different and it does change; and it's not superfluous."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters. Representative Matijeich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijeich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows Representative Geo-Karis and I don't often agree; but she's absolutely right because it has been written wrongly, the Amendment has because it says 'shall equal a quorum'. If he had said 'shall equal at least a quorum', then it would be correct. But I think you have a poorly drafted Amendment here, Alan; and you'd better do some work on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, poorly drafted or not, I would like to speak to the Amendment. I happen to support it. I remember last year when we passed the rule, Representative Hanahan's rule, and I predicted then, and my predictions have been borne out, that those who have the power get the Members . . . substitute Members in that Committee. I disagree with the Chairman of the Rules Committee saying 'It's worked well, that Members do attend Committee meetings'. That just isn't so in the Committees I sit on. They send substitutes, and I object to that because I don't know how those substitutes are voting, whether they're instructed to vote, in which case they might as well have . . . we might as well go back to proxy voting. Otherwise, they don't really know what they're voting on because they're just there for a half an hour to cast a vote on the Bill. And guess who gets them there, the ones who have the power. And I would remind the



freshman Legislators that they'd better be interested in this because right now with very few exceptions you don't have any power either. And it's very difficult to get your Bill through a Committee if you need a majority of the Committee. I think it's . . . it was a bad rule we passed. I disagree with the Chairman of the Rules Committee that says it's worked well. It's only worked for those who can . . . pretty much get their way around here anyway."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Amendment offered by my running mate of the 15th District, Representative Greiman. I understand that at times legislation which each and every one of us is interested in loses in Committee because of a one or two vote difference where if we operated under the old rules it would pass. And I think the last year's experience, however, when many of us reluctantly voted for this rule to begin with, the last year's experience, however, has proven I think that overall it has worked out very well. Let me just give for your consideration one illustration. If this rule change went into effect, a Committee of 18 Members would require 10 Members to be there to constitute a quorum, two-thirds of that 10 could pass a Bill which would mean 7. So, in fact, you've got 7 Members out of an 18-Member Committee voting for a Bill, passing legislation out with a 'do pass' coming to this House floor. And those who have been here in the past I think have realized that the Committee Reports that we have seen on a 5 to 4, 7 to 5 vote and an 8 to 6 vote were those Bills precisely which took up the most amount of time in terms of discussion on this House floor and which ultimately were the Bills that were defeated on this House floor. I sympathize totally with what Representative Greiman is trying to get at; but I think the rule that we have instituted last Session has worked well for us, does not go, as has been suggested, to 'the power brokers' whoever they may be. All of us are power brokers on our Committees if as Members of the Committee we take our responsibilities seriously and attend those Committee meetings. Thank you."

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



Unknown: "It's U.C.L.A. next, Mr. Speaker."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Would a Member voting in Committee 'present' be recorded under your Amendment as a vote cast?"

Greiman: "No, he would not. It would require . . . you would only add the affirmative and negative votes so that you're voting 'present' still . . . you'd have to see a 'no' and he could frustrate the quorum number. Yes?"

Totten: "You mean, if three Members voted . . . well let's see, 2 Members voted 'aye', 1 Member voted 'no' and 10 Members voted 'present', that would equal with two-thirds and it would also equal a quorum, would it not, in most Committees?"

Greiman: "No, it would not. You have that three, and if the quorum is 10, it takes 10 people voting. It would not pass. The 'present' vote would not count. It says affirmative and negative votes equal the quorum. So the answer to that is 'no'."

Totten: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you calling on me. I know you've been ignoring me earlier today. I think you must know I'm a University of Michigan alum and we certainly dismantled some slovenly team last weekend . . . leaving that aside, I did have something of significance to say. I rise in opposition to this particular motion because I think it is to the utmost importance that we as Legislators do a little more to protect our constituents. If you go home and talk to a few people in the neighborhoods they will tell you if there's one thing they are sick of its garbage legislation. And 9 out of 10 times they'll say to you, 'If you just pass nothing and leave me alone, I'd be happier'. And anything we can do to make it more difficult to pass more Bills that bother other people, mess up their lives and spend their money, the more we can do to block that, the better off we are. And if we can't get half the Members of a Committee to support our Bill, it wasn't much of a Bill anyway. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats, I neglected . . . you took me by surprise. I also went to Northwestern. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I have one of those little nothing Bills that's being held in the Revenue Committee. Getting 11 or 12 votes 'yes', no votes 'no' and the rest the people are voting 'present' for some reason. However, considering the arguments, I understand this little Bill is not going to solve my problem because I still wouldn't have a majority. So I'm totally perplexed on how to vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, let me ask leave of the House, on line 8 to insert after the word 'equal', the words 'at least' . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections to making that Amendment on the face?"

Greiman: ". . . Thank you, thank you . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing none, Mr. Clerk . . ."

Greiman: ". . . To close, you know, I was in the Insurance Committee the other day. There were 20 some Members there. They gave me an hour and a quarter hearing. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman. They then voted against my Bill. But I appreciated it. They were all there. I don't mind losing that way. I mind losing to empty chairs though. Mr. Keats, the Gentleman from Cook from the 1st District, speaks, I'm sure, from great experience. When he stands in April or May before empty Committees with some great Bill of his that will destroy the bureaucracy that he hates, he will be very sorry because there will be empty chairs and they don't vote. I just want to be able to go to a Committee, look at other human beings, tell them what I feel about a Bill; and, hopefully, they'll believe me and they'll go my way. But not to empty chairs, not to oaken buckets. This is a good compromise. It protects Members. They should have a right to have their Bills heard by people sitting there. That's not going to be the case. Incidentally, the Chairman of the Rules Committee who has been speaking said that it's worked. I don't know that it's worked. We've never had it in the real April and May. We don't know that it's worked. And I think that all of us, come April, come May . . . Harold, relax, relax . . . come April, come May, when you look at those empty chairs you're going to remember this Amendment. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #26. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 38 'aye' and 92 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. 27."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #27, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 40 by deleting lines 5 through 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, I have one . . . this one relates to a custom that we have had for many years in the House with a big room and we can now often get to our seats to vote. Now, sometimes our seatmate will vote us, wherever the legal consequences there are, that's the fact, that's the truth. We have been able to go up to the well and give our votes. if we have not gotten there in time. It has a big room. If I go to my friend, Peter, Peter is over there, my running mate from the 15th District, I can't get across here to vote very easily. And so often one would give their votes to the well after the vote had been registered. I don't think that the Chair will say that you can't change their vote. And I must say to you even taking off my . . . Rule 58, doesn't mean the Speaker will still allow that. But that prohibits anybody doing that. And I think . . . I think it's a time-honored custom; and I see nothing wrong with the custom."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With regard to this particular rule the Speaker, who is the Chairman of Rules Committee, told the Rules Committee that he has had a great deal of difficulty with the laxness with which voting takes place here. And he felt that voting is such a serious matter that it ought to be done in a very very defined way. People were calling Clerk's offices, apparently, and trying to change votes. And he felt that that interfered with the sanctity of the proceedings of the House, and so he told the Rules Committee that he would like a firm rule that voting is voting and do your voting when the voting takes place. If not that way, it's got to be not looking up to the Clerk, but unanimous consent of the



Members of this House. He wanted it all done in the record, above-board. And that was what he said. Now, I think the Speaker understood the problem that Mr. Greiman mentioned. The Rules Committee decided that the Speaker's concern was a legitimate one, that they were not interested or in . . . trying to inconvenience Members, but that the importance of having a process that was certain, and sure and not open to argument later outweighed the question of the convenience of individual Members. Accordingly, the Speaker's suggestion was adopted and all I could tell you is that there is much sympathy on the part of all us for the problem Mr. Greiman mentioned; but at least the feeling of the Rules Committee was that those considerations of convenience are outweighed by the heavy public responsibilities we have and the necessity for absolute accountability for us in the exercise of our voting here in the House chamber."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #27; and I think maybe for some different reasons than the Gentleman who's Chairman of the Rules Committee indicated. It has been my observation that many General Assemblies or Legislatures have the ability to provide their Journals and actions of the previous day available to the Members of the General Assembly the next day. And when I inquired as to why we weren't able to do that here in Illinois, one of the main reasons was the fact that the process for recording votes of those Members who did not get on the automatic Roll Call was such that the steps taken prevented that Journal from being printed, maybe not only for 1 day, but for 2, 3, 4 or maybe even more days than that. I think that it is also important that the Members of the General Assembly should be in their seats when we are voting on matters and not the confusion that exists on the present House floor with Members all over, with lobbyists on the floor. And that if we were required to cast our votes at the time that Bill was called, and I think as I indicated latter . . . earlier in this Session, that the unanimous consent that is required in the present Resolution should not be treated lightly. I think that we should proceed with the business of this House in a much more





orderly fashion if we were required to be in our seats and vote. And I think the Speaker has been more than courteous up to this point in allowing Members to vote. And for these reasons, this Amendment should not be adopted and the present Resolution is a good one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I think this is a good Amendment to strike out this rule. Even in its early stage, we have seen how this proposal doesn't work. In the back of the room, and if the Speaker happens to take the record, you'll have to shout from the other end of the room, or come running down here and make a jump, and you may miss. I think today I saw Representative Geo-Karis miss one. If this rule is adopted . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Shame."

Deuster: ". . . if this . . . if this rule stands the way it is, you can't waik up there and say, 'Gee, I was in the back of the room, or I was running down the corridor, or I pushed my button and I missed', or something. This is a preposterous rule, although the motivation is pure and good. And I think Representative Greiman has a good Amendment to strike that out so we can continue our practice of going up here and telling the Clerk, 'Put me on that Bill because I just missed it'. Sure there'll be some abuses, but for the great majority of Members, it allows us to avoid holding up the full business on this floor or cajoling the Speaker not to take the record so we can all run back to our own desks. And I urge support of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, there . . . I didn't realize it was a health measure when I put it in; but I do . . . I do think it has merit. There are some traditions that we have that aren't all bad. I think we ought not to be slaves to the machine. There is a machine. And we, you know . . . and I would hope that you would join me with this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Wait until Representative Schneider gets to his seat. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 51 'aye' and 76 'no'; the Gentleman's motion fails. 28. Wait a minute now.



Representative Ryan. The pain of excommunication, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's with great privilege that I introduce 'Mr. Bill Mittiff', a former Township Chairman of Waukegan from the 31st District; represented by Representatives Geo-Karis, Griesheimer and Matijevich, in this balcony right here. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 28."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 28 . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 11."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative . . ."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment 28 has already been considered by the House. And I would ask leave to table it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment 28 is tabled. 29."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 29, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 25, line 26, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "The . . . the contents of 29 has also been heard; and I ask leave for tabling."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, 29 is tabled. 30."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #30, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, the matters which are in Amendment 30 have not been considered. And I will ask leave to table; but I would like a word of explanation. In the rules of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly, we laid upon the Parliamentarian and others an obligation to provide by February 1st of the odd numbered year jurisdiction, a statement of jurisdiction of Committees so that there will be less squabbling and less babbling over the assignment of Committees, and so that there would be a criteria for the assignment of Bills to Committee. I'm going to table this which this . . . Amendment which, add that on again on the . . . however, I will tell you that the



Parliamentarian has advised me that he has done the work that was required under the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly and that he will have in his office or the Office of the Speaker a summary within about two weeks of the Committee jurisdiction. And I would ask leave to table 30 now."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, Amendment 30 is tabled. 31."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 31, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 20, line 25, and so forth."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Greiman, could you restate your position?"

Greiman: "Restate my position on Amendment 30?"

Madigan: "I didn't hear your statement relevant to the . . ."

Greiman: "Well, the Parliamentarian has advised me that he has done the work required under 14.1 of the rules of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly, which are the temporary rules of this . . . of this General Assembly. And that in . . . he will be able to prepare the kind of summary that was required by the 14.1. And that he will have available for observation, for looking at it as a guide to Members as far as where their Bill should go. But it would not be part of the rules as is required in 14.1, which is what I discussed with you. I tabled it, yes. It's already been tabled though."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 31."

Greiman: "It's not a requirement, it's not a condition. It's been tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "30 has been tabled."

Madigan: "Thank you, Alan."

Greiman: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "31. Representative Greiman on 31."

Greiman: "Well, 31 is a very small matter. Previously, Bills could be introduced by being prepared by the Reference Bureau or you could go and bring your Bill to the Reference Bureau if it had some secret purpose or some confidentiality that you wanted to continue. And the Reference Bureau would stamp it as being approved as to form. This has been taken out. I merely put it back in that you could take a Bill or take a Resolution that you drafted, bring it to the Reference



Bureau and have them stamp it as to form. Now, one of the problems that will be raised is that they now put everything on computers; but they can put it on the computer after you have brought it in. It doesn't have to be before. It must be brought in for approval as to form. And I just want to put the old rule back that's all. It's not a matter of great moments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "The Reference Bureau is our service agency. We now have staffed them, we have an information service where our Bills are put on computer, we have a highly organized system. And it was the feeling of the Rules Committee that in that situation to have Bills emanate from other sources and never go into the Reference Bureau is a subject that creates difficulty in the processes of the House. And it's totally unnecessary. The fact is that wherever we get Bills from we do not want to have technical errors in the Bills. And sending our Bills through the Reference Bureau actually makes our Bills stronger and less vulnerable to attack or to improper draftsmanship. So both from the point of view of good draftsmanship and the point of view of our information service under which the Bills are computerized, it makes no sense to go to the system where anybody brings a Bill in and drops it in the hopper. Accordingly, the Rules Committee I think in a unanimous vote, as I recall, or very close to it urged the adoption of the requirement that the Legislative Reference Bureau has to see Bills. You can still get Bills where you want to; but you have to take them to the Reference Bureau for them to go over them to put them on their computer and give them back to you in the form that meets the statutory requirement of the State of Illinois. Accordingly, we would urge the defeat of Amendment #31."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan. He's sorry."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask why we were tabling Amendment #30, but I think it's out of order now."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 31. Those in favor of the adoption say 'aye', opposed 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it and the motion fails. 32."



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #32, Greiman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 29, line 15, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, leave to table Amendment 32."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave?"

Greiman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 33."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #33, Chapman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 11 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman. Chapman."

Chapman: "I ask leave to table proposed rule #33."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted and Amendment 33 is tabled. 34."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #34, Walsh, amends House Resolution 94 by adding after Rule 33(a) the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I've been advised to ask leave to table this, Mr. Speaker. Do you object to that?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, 34 is tabled. 35, Representative Schlickman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 35 amends House Resolution 94 by striking Rules 34(c) and . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman here. Representative Katz.

I think he told me he wasn't going to persist in this. I may be in error, but . . . okay. Those in favor of the adoption say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the motion fails. 36."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 36, Kent, amends House Resolution 94 by inserting between Rules 18(j) and 18(k) the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This Bill will say that no Committee may post more than 50 Bills or Resolutions for one meeting. As Spokesman for the Executive Committee, many times I have known us to have more than 50 Bills posted for one hearing. It's impossible to do any of them justice. It doesn't say we can't have more meetings in one week. All it says that we limit each hearing day to just 50 Bills.



I hope you will approve of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, in general the Rules Committee opposed limitations that would interfere with the orderly conduct of Committees and removing discretion. However, the distinguished Spokesperson for the Executive Committee has raised a very important point. It is a fact that when the Executive Committee posts something with 75 Bills it is absolutely impossible for any Member of the public to know what's going on, including the rest of us. And, certainly, no one can take exception to the 50 as a minimum. Accordingly, I do not personally believe that the suggestion would interfere with the needed flexibility to our Committees. I do think it would afford a beginning in terms of trying to reasonably limit the number of Bills on posting because the fact is that having too many Bills posted defeats, in fact, the need of posting and, in fact, nullifies the whole process of posting. So I commend the distinguished Spokesperson and would support her suggestion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Mary Lou Kent has a very good Amendment. However, as Chairman of the Executive Committee last Session we just couldn't have gotten the work done. I think what we ought to do is really try to get at the heart of the problem. The problem is that we introduce too many Bills. And maybe we ought to look at the next Amendment, which is Representative Schuneman's, which is a limitation on Bills that individual Sponsors introduce. Then we'll answer the problem because we just have had too many Bills introduced by individual Sponsors. I think we shouldn't even address the matter of limitations in this particular way. If we don't . . . if we do introduce a lot of Bills, and we're getting down to the crunch, the Executive Committee, for example, which has so many Bills, really would be able to handle them if you hamstring them. I know what Mary Lou is talking about. She has the right . . . probably the right idea; but if we don't limit these Bills, I don't know how Ralph Capparelli and the Committee are really going to come out with the Bills. I'm sorry



that I . . . I'll have to oppose her, but I'm surely going to support Representative Schuneman in the next Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Further discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I just want to support Mary Lou Kent because I am looking around at the empty chairs, and I can assure you when they have 50 Bills to hear in a Committee, they're going to have more empty chairs in that Committee hearing. And I think it's a good Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent to close."

Kent: "Thank you. I would urge Mr. Greiman, especially, to support this Bill because many of the points that he has made in other Amendments could be covered this way. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, will you forgive me and do you seek recognition? Representative Meyer's was standing in your way, that was the problem."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker, I, too, reluctantly rise to oppose this Resolu . . . this Amendment. As another former Member of the Exec . . . Chairman of the Executive Committee, I know how hard it is to cover the ground that you want sometimes, and that Committee, of course, considers more Bills and Resolutions than any other Committee. Further than that, sometimes you just might have to post to comply with the 30-day meet . . . the 30-day rule for posting. But beyond that the Amendment . . . the Amendment goes on to say that a Committee may schedule more than one meeting during a week; but it must follow the posting and notice requirements of Rule 18, which is well and good, except that many times we may have to have a continued meeting during that week and I think that this Amendment would preclude that. Not only that but we do have occasions . . . we do have occasions where we might have to continue a meeting simply because the Session of the House ran overtime; and I believe this Amendment would also preclude that unless you would have the foresight to post in advance. So I think that I'm in half agreement with one part of this Amendment and total disagreement in the other. And I think that this . . . this Amendment should be rejected."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Keats."



Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to move the question. I oppose her."

Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye', 28 'no'; and the motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. 37."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 37, Schuneman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 19, line 31, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #37 deals with an idea whose time I hope and believe has come. The Amendment would limit the number of Bills that any one Member could introduce. The number in the Amendment is 10 Bills in any one Calendar year; but I want to point out that there are some important exceptions to that number. The 10 Bills would not include any appropriation Bills, would not include any Bills a Member might introduce at the request of a Legislative Commission. And the Amendment also provides a means for introducing more than 10 Bills if there is something of an emergency nature in the district of the Legislator or of an emergency nature in the state. Amendment #37 would in my opinion provide some stop to this terrible flow legislation that has this House bogged down from this time on to June 30. And I would move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not sure that all of the Members are aware that the Rules Committee has incorporated in these rules, and I commend the Rules Committee. I think they've done a real good job in working out these permanent rules. I think it's the best job that I've ever seen any Rules Committee do since I've been here in the Legislature. And they have incorporated into these permanent rules a new procedure where we can introduce Member proposals. Dwight Friedrich and I have been speaking to this for some time. As a matter of policy, I never really did favor limiting individual introduction of Bills. But as the Chairman of the Executive Committee, and, frankly, that's the only reason I oppose Representative Mary Lou Kent in the last Amendment





that she had. You have to be practical. And if we don't do something about the volume, frankly, we're going to be suspending your rule that you just adopted. And I think now that we have the route of Member proposals, now we ought to be talking about limiting individual sponsorship of Bills. And the Member-proposal concept will really work better then if we have some limitations. And in fact what will happen is that we Members will be more selective in the Bills that we introduce. And I think that 10 is enough in a Calendar year. We can all pick 10 good Bills that any of us really think are important. And I commend Representative Schuneman. I think finally the time has come. And I commend this Amendment to the full Membership and urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just have one problem with this. I'm in favor of it; but I'm wondering what happens to the fellow who has 12 Bills introduced at this point or 10 or such a number. What would the Chair do about that? I don't have it, but I expect there's some Members who do."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman, do you have a ready response?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Sir. If that question is directed at me, I suppose something like a grandfather clause could be inserted, or I might suggest that since self-restraint is the essence of what we're talking about here that that Legislator perhaps should pick out the 10 best Bills and table the rest of them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on its face this seems like an excellent idea; but I want you to think very carefully about what we're doing here. You're shutting off an elected Members right to introduce anything that he pleases. Now, sometimes . . . I don't expect to have 10 Bills this year, I probably won't have 6; but I can remember back a few years that I had one idea for one Bill and I had to put in 19 Bills, a whole series to accomplish one thing. We had to amend 19 different Sections. It was only one idea, but it took 19 Bills. And this could happen many times along the way. Furthermore, I wouldn't have to introduce a single Bill all year."



All I'd do is just amend somebody else's Bill. And you've got to remember when you put a Bill in at least it goes to Committee, the public is aware of it, people have a chance to come down and testify. And when I tag an Amendment on somebody else's Bill on Second Reading, nobody knows what's said. So I want you to think very carefully what you're doing if you support this. And I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I find myself somewhat in the situation of Representative Matijevec's suggestion. I have always been opposed to limiting the number of Bills; but even in the situation that was last . . . just suggested to us by the previous speaker, I think you could follow the proposal route perhaps to get these handled. I think you could probably see that . . . that a Committee would draft the Bills, and get them on the floor when you have whole series of Bills of that kind. I see that . . . I don't think it's going to hamper you in your own legislation and when you have to handle other things because the Commission Bills and the Appropriation Bills are excluded under this. And I think it's going to cause us to be somewhat more selective. And I think it would give me a good opportunity to say to people when they come to me with Bills, 'Now, wait a minute, I want to look at all of these proposals you people from my district are bringing to me because I can only put 10 Bills in of this kind; and I've got to put in the ones that are really the most needed at this time'. And if there are emergencies coming after that, it's taken care of in here too so that I can still represent my district. And I think that this is really a sensible Bill. And it's going to make me as a Representative considerably more selective and more careful in the Bills that I put in. And I'm not going to put a Bill in that I might have to table, that it's not in the proper shape when I put it in. It might cause the Committee to less work to do because I should get it in a lot better shape before the Bill goes in because I'm not going to waste that one Bill. So I think this deserves some serious consideration and while we weigh all the factors there's some things that might weigh against it. But I believe on the whole it weighs out to be a pretty good proposal at



this time in these rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again we have a proposal to deal with a serious problem and I admit it is a serious problem that addresses quantity instead of quality. And I don't care what type of rules you make; if you've got a Legislator who is sloppy, he's going to be sloppy 10 times or 15 times no matter how he does it. If you've got a Legislator who's going to be careful and evaluative, no matter whether he's limited to 10 Bills or whatever, he's going to be that way. And I think if we're going to solve a problem, let's not solve it by talking in terms of quantities, but in terms of how are we going to encourage Members to improve their performance on the floor of the House. How are we going to encourage them to be more responsible? I don't think putting limitations on Members is going to do that. And for that reason I would urge that we defeat this proposed Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the previous speakers objected to this Bill on the grounds that we would be shutting off a Legislator's right to introduce legislation. And he pointed out the example of a situation which would require a series of 12 Bills. Well, I'd like to point out to you that in the Amendment we make provision for just exactly that situation. If there is an emergency situation that would require more than 10 Bills, there's a provision for handling that in this Amendment. The . . . the overriding reason for this Amendment being offered is that I get the word from the people back in my district that they're demanding that we pass less legislation; but that our legislation be of higher quality. We simply don't have enough time to devote the study and attention demanded by the important legislation coming before us. We have Members who introduce as many as 100 Bills in each



Session. I'm told by the Legislative Reference Bureau that they've already prepared over 4,200 Bills for us to consider this Session. We wallow in a sea of legislation where the rule seems to be quantity instead of quality. I think the essence of the proposal that we have here is self-restraint that each Legislator can decide for himself which are the 10 most important issues that he would like to bring before this Body and that the other issues can be handled by some other Member of the Body or can await the time in some later year. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of Amendment #37 to the House rules."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #37. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Deuster, do you seek recognition?"

Deuster: "Yes, I would like to encourage some careful thought on this proposal and to encourage some 'no' votes. The purpose of a Legislature is to consider ideas. And our Constitution provides that our citizens have the right to make their opinions known to their Legislators and to seek a redress to their grievances. I have a serious question in my mind as to whether this kind of a proposal is even constitutional notwithstanding whether it is proper. I think the solution is not to cut off the introduction of ideas and thoughts to be considered, but the real problem that we've got to in our Committees look at these Bills and where a Member . . . and I . . . Mr. Speaker, because I have introduced more than my limit, but if I've got some bad Bills . . . if I have some bad Bills . . . I had one that was a real bad Bill. I think it maybe got 10 or 12 'yes' votes on the floor, one. And that should . . . that Bill maybe should never have come out of Committee. So I think what we ought to do is to in our Committees try and be more discriminating but let those ideas come to the Committees. If they're good ideas to improve the State of Illinois, we should not be arbitrary. We have fooled around and experimented with 30 days and 45 days in a lot of arbitrary deadlock . . . deadlines. And this 10-Bill limit is just another one. I encourage a thoughtful 'no' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm sure that everything that could be said has been said. So let me simply repeat that while this is a tempting Amendment to adopt, some day it will cut off one of your rights to represent your district. As an example, I've introduced a series of Bills this Session on condominiums. They came out of a Commission, which as I mentioned earlier Representative Merlo and I had, the nature of the legislation is such that it requires I don't know how many Bills 8, 9, 10, 12, 20, whatever it is to deal with the subject matter. So if I or you want to deal with a particular problem in your district that requires because of the nature of the law you're amending, a series of Bills, you are then precluding yourself from participating in any other legislative initiative on your own for the rest of the Session. I think every Member ought to think twice before they vote for this appealing, and it is appealing at first blush, Amendment. You'll be sorry for it some day. It's going to hurt yourself. It's going to hurt the people in your district. And if this Amendment is adopted, I can assure you . . . I can assure you that you'll be sorry and you'll be trying to figure out a way to repeal the Amendment."

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

Ewell: ". . . I'm going to heed my time to the interest of the Body."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think I'll yield my time since the vote has gone the way I would have like to ask it to have gone . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Which way do you yield in it?"

Dunn, R.: ". . . I'm going to yield it to the House in the interest of time. It has enough votes to defeat the Amendment. I think this is a good idea. Thank you."

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

Schuneman: "As the Sponsor of the Amendment I believe I have the right to explain my vote, do I not? I'd like to point out that as far as legislation pertaining to any one district is concerned, each district



has 4 elected Representatives in this General Assembly, Now, that's 40 Bills that could be introduced by those 4 Legislators, 3 in the House and 1 in the Senate. What we do about the problem of too many Bills, it's been my observation, is talk about it. And anytime a proposal comes along to do something about it, it loses. And I think we're going to have to reverse that procedure. I'm not sure, frankly, whether this is the right way to do it or the wrong way, but it's one way. And I think we're making a mistake by passing up this one last opportunity to do something about this sea of legislation that's going to come down on us like confetti in just a few weeks."

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

Matijevich: "Just a quick explanation. I really didn't think that the Members would find that our time has come; but the Member-proposal route I think will work. And next Session we're going to limit ourselves."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, do you seek recognition?"

Skinner: "Yes, Representative Matijevich can file another Amendment if he wishes to deal with it next year or the year after that. He doesn't have to speak twice on the issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 66 'aye' and 86 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. 38."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #38, Bowman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 57 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The hour is late and I know everyone is very tired; but I would just like to urge everyone to take a copy of House Resolution 94, and take a look at it by turning to the second page, correction, third page and look under Roman Numeral 12, entitled Disciplinary Proceedings. And I ask you, is there something missing there? Is there something missing there? We have such things as initiating disciplinary proceedings, preliminary investigations, report a special Committee and so forth. I suggest that there is in fact something missing there, and that is that we have here in the Resolution proceedings here for disciplining our Membership . . .



Mr. Speaker . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please. Representative Skinner, will you give the Gentleman order?"

Bowman: ". . . if we don't get order, I'm going to ask for disciplinary proceedings to be initiated against him . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "I think the Speaker has certain powers which he may feel impelled to use. Proceed, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: ". . . Very good. Thank you . . . okay, what is missing there is any statement to the effect that certain conduct is prohibited. Now if this Resolution were adopted without some Amendment which specifies what the ground rules are, which should be a guide to our conduct. that would be roughly equivalent to tossing out the Criminal Code and allowing the Police Department to go around arresting people when they think they're doing something that they shouldn't be doing. And I think in the interest of basic fairness we ought to include in our rules some statement of what kind of conduct is to be expected of . . . as Legislators. So let me read very . . . the active portion of my Amendment which would be to add a Section under that Roman numeral entitling . . . entitled, Behavior Subject to Disciplinary Action as follows: 'The Governmental Ethics Act of 1967 as amended shall be fined a proper exercise of legislative responsibility. All allegations and charges of impropriety against a Member of the House included in a petition requesting a special investigating Committee or presented to a special investigating Committee for pursuit to House Resolution shall be limited to performance of restricted activities as defined in the Act, Article II, or to violations of the Code of Conduct as defined in Article II of the Act'. So there you have it. We have restricted activities already defined in the statutes, and a Code of Conduct for which I might add there are no penalties for violation currently in the statutes. I think the House of Representatives is the appropriate Body to implement the Governmental Ethics Act of 1967; and I think it is a fair and decent thing to provide a guide, a code of conduct, to our Members if we then expect to hold them accountable. And I think it would be absurd and mischievous . . . mischievous to have



a Resolution which provides some disciplinary proceedings without also specifying some code of conduct. And since this is already in the statutes, the code of conduct is already in the statutes, I recommend this to you for inclusion in our rules by reference. I, respectfully, ask an affirmative Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question . . . Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In rising to oppose Amendment #38, I would suggest to the Sponsor of the Amendment that the issue is not quite as simple to address as he apparently thinks that it is. I would point out to the Members that we adopted a rule on disciplinary action in the Seventy-Ninth Session. And that adoption of that rule was done over a rather extended period of time. This is a highly complex, a very sensitive subject, one that took this Body a great deal of time to address itself to. The Governmental Ethics Act as referred to in this Amendment and the two Articles of that Act that the Amendment would address itself to, Article II, first of all, restricted activities, refers to criminal action. Article III refers to code of conduct. And I would point out that in part II of Article II, the statutes expressly provide that the purpose of that part of the code of conduct is intended only as guides to legislative conduct, and specifically states that these are not rules meant to be enforced by disciplinary action. The net effect of adopting Amendment #38, in effect, then would be to violate state law. Now, in addition to that to use the Governmental Ethics Act as the sole standard of legislative behavior which would be subject to disciplinary action may well be creating a situation, not of being too broad, but frankly of being too narrow. I would suggest that this is a proper subject that perhaps could be most expeditiously handled, and most completely handled by simply referring it as the substantive matter for further consideration by the full Rules Committee. I would also point out that this proposed Amendment was not submitted to the Rules Committee when it was considering adoption of House rules. I, therefore, ask the Membership to defeat Amendment #38."





Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd only point out that under the Resolution as it now stands without my Amendment, it would be possible for any Member of the House to initiate the disciplinary proceedings against any other Member of the House with reference to anything that isn't a Governmental Ethics Act or anything else if that Member so desires. I think that we are not creating any new standard of conduct here. What we are, in fact, doing is protecting the Membership if you will from very pernicious and frivolous kinds of charges. And I think the Representative is quite mistaken in his opposition. So I again respectfully request an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Geo-Karis is closing fast. I think that rule was intended for one or two Members. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 36 'aye' and 86 'no'; the Gentleman's motion fails. 40 . . . 39."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #39, Walsh-Schlickman, amends House Resolution 94 on page 36 by deleting all of lines 31 through 34 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the most mischievous thing that the Rules Committee in their alleged wisdom did. Mr. Speaker, this removes from the Membership the right to demand a verification. Now, let that sink in. This means that the Members may not demand that a vote is accurate. This permits the Speaker at his discretion to demand a Roll Call or to order a Roll Call which is not an electrical Roll Call, an electrical Roll Call is the only one that may be verified by an individual Member. Now, the rule states that an individual Member may at the time a Member votes on an oral Roll Call, he may challenge that vote. But I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be almost impossible to be recognized by the Chair for a challenge in the confusion of an oral Roll Call. Furthermore, the Speaker, the Clerk, no one would know who was interested in demanding a verification of that individual vote. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this takes from the Members, it gives



to the Speaker, one of the most valuable tools, one of the most valuable rights that the Membership has and that is to demand that the votes that we have recorded on measures are accurate. And that nothing passes this House that does not have a sufficient number of votes to do so. For those of you who were here in the last Session, I would ask you to recall the time that the Speaker would not permit a verified Roll Call. Now can you imagine someone in that Chair, who is very interested in a measure passing or not passing, and what they would do to an individual Member who tried to challenge someone way over here or way over there on their oral Roll Call. And I submit that this rule says that following that persons vote, no one can challenge it. The instant the Clerk calls the next name on the Roll Call, the right to challenge that vote is gone. This is a very serious matter. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this amendment does not pass, this is reason enough to vote against House Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have found here on the House floor that one of the most time-consuming things that we have had has been verifications. I think every Member of the Rules Committee, however, is in favor of verifications. A proposal was made this time, not incidently by a Democrat, but a Member from the other side of the House as I recall it. A proposal that we experiment with the possibility of a different kind of verification to be used in limited situations where the Member would rise and call out his vote as the Roll Call was made so that there could be no question about who the person is. And I would only say to you that I cannot say to the Gentleman who just spoke with certainty how the procedure will operate. I do want to say, however, that it will operate fairly or will not be used. It is given under the proposal to the option of the Speaker to try out the new method and see if it is, in fact, time-consu . . . timesaving in a limited situation. But I feel very safe in assuring the Member that if in fact if the procedure is tried and the procedure in fact is not there and does not protect the Members on both sides of the aisle that it



will be a procedure that the Speaker will not use. It is an indication of the confidence that the Members on the other side have in the basic fairness of the Speaker that this proposal emanated from the Republican side. And so I would say to you that the concerns are really too much. They are not well-based. The procedure will be tried. If it does not work out fairly, it will not be used any further. So accordingly we would oppose Amendment #39, which deletes this promising other way of verification that the Rules Committee adopted by a very overwhelming vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Well, I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished Vice-Chairman of the Rules Committee is absolutely wrong. And I ask you to consider again the chances you have for recognition if you want to challenge the vote of someone over there whose name has been called and someone may vote his switch. Lord knows what may happen; but before you have a chance to react, and certainly before the Speaker has a chance to recognize you, if whoever is in the Chair is inclined to recognize you, the next name has been called, and you have forever lost your opportunity to verify that vote. Now, this is bad, Mr. Speaker. We are giving unto the Speaker that which belongs to the Membership. It is bad. We will live to regret it. And, again, I say that if I were you and this Amendment is not adopted, I'd vote 'no' on House Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: ". . . is approaching time for verification, I notice that one of the Gentleman who I know fairly well did not punch his own switch this time. Would you care to dump the Roll Call and get an honest one?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative Walsh's Amendment to the rules. I think it's time in retrospect that perhaps the Rules Committee may not have thought out all the ramifications of the new method of verification of Roll Calls. I think Representative



Walsh has a very valid point on the challenging of votes of individual Members to the House. We are a large Body of 177 Members. And some of the Members may remember in the past in other Sessions where there have been Members that have vacated their seats temporarily to other places of the Capitol; and those that are not Members of the House have occupied their chairs. And there have been problems along these lines. So I would suggest that we support Representative Walsh's Amendment in fairness of the verification so the people of Illinois will have an opportunity to have a verified Roll Call; and one that's fair that protects the majority as well as the minority. And I very enthusiastically support this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "I'll yield as long as the motion is carrying."

Speaker Redmond: "I see at least two Members who are not in their seats who have been voted. I'm going to ask the Clerk to dump this Roll Call and admonish the Members to vote only their switches. Mr. Clerk, will you dump the Roll Call? Those in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Katz."

Katz: "No, no, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I was explaining to Mr. Holewinski how the new procedure was and you thought I was asking for recognition."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we debated this issue quite extensively in the Rules Committee. And, in turn, it was adopted by quite a substantial margin. Let me point out to you the procedure that's supposed to be followed. In the reference to the oral Roll Call vote, which shall be administered by the Clerk, the procedure to be followed is supposed to be a timesaving device for the Membership of this Body. The procedure is as follows. The Speaker knowing a very critical issue that may be coming up would ask that the vote be done by an oral Roll Call. The person would rise, and in turn would respond to the inquiry as far as when a name is called, how he's voting on a specific proposal, whether it be 'yes' or 'no'. And, in turn, be asked to hit or press his switch accordingly. There was some concern, Ladies and Gentlemen, of whether the



person who is rising and responding would again correspondingly vote his switch or possibly change it at a later time. It was the consensus of the opinion of the Rules Committee that that person when he records his Roll Call orally there would be the binding vote. And, in turn, the specific measure was thoroughly discussed; and I think that we know the Speaker of this House and his fairness. And, in turn, I can assure you because I verify a lot of Roll Calls in this place you can save a lot of time by going through an oral Roll Call, asking a person to respond, and the procedures also involve that the person is not there, after the entire Roll Call is completed a person in turn can go through and express . . . and get on the Roll Call. So every objection that Representative Walsh pointed out was discussed and, in turn, I would hope the Membership would defeat this proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Conti, second time."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, the only reason why I rise is as I recall so many times in the end of the Session the time is late . . . the hour is late like it is now, and there are some 200 Bills to consider today, 250 to 300 Bills. And you see many of them leave, and you see some people that want to stay and are interested in Bills running up and down the aisles voting and pushing all kinds of buttons. A lot of people go back home, get accused of voting for a Bill, they weren't even here to vote on the Bill. And I think that's the most dangerous thing about this because we should have a verification of the Roll Call. And, therefore, those of us who have . . . or can't be here on the floor of the House, and someone pushes my button, and votes me a way that I don't want to or I can't explain back home. This will make this dangerous."

Speaker Redmond: "I think there's a misunderstanding about what is intended here. This was my suggestion. And the reason that I . . . and the reason that I ma . . . I'll get down on the floor and explain my vote if you wish, Mr. Walsh. Okay, okay . . ."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Speaker at Representative Martin's desk."



Speaker Redmond: "... Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was my suggestion. And the only reason that I did was for the protection of the Members. There have been many, many times just recently when we dumped the Roll Call, where a Member's vote was recorded and he wasn't in his seat. And the thought occurred to me that the best way to do that is in contested matters when we know mighty well there's going to be a verification. And there's a tendency on the part of some Members to vote their seatmate's switch. I thought that it was a good idea to give the Speaker the alternative, that when he knew that situation was arising that he would call for an oral Roll Call. And the procedure is very simple. When the Clerk calls the Roll, starting with the letter 'A', and the Gentleman or the Lady whose name has been called will arise and orally indicate whether they want to be voted 'aye' or 'nay'. And simultaneously the Clerk will record on the Roll Call the way the Roll Call is to be recorded. Now, this is more protection in my judgment for not having somebody vote your switch because unless somebody responds and is standing and everybody else is seated I don't see that there's any way in the world for somebody to vote somebody else's switch. I don't know whether it's going to work or not. I just assure you that my intention is to use it to try to protect the Members so that we don't have people voting someone else's switch and you get embarrassed in the way your vote has been recorded. And I can assure you that if it doesn't work, we will go back to the way it was before. This is not an exclusive thing, this is some kind of an experiment to see whether or not we can't in some way protect our Members from people voting the switches and also to see if we can't accelerate the business of this House. And that is the reason that I am voting 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well just briefly, I think the Speaker has an excellent idea. And I'm glad that he explained the motivation for it, which is to make sure that we have accurate votes. The only problem is that language should be struck out that says this. Suppose the Speaker decides to have an 'A' through 'Z' verified Roll Call and everybody stands up that



says any Member may challenge the vote of any other Member at the time his vote is cast. I'm not sure what that means, but if you're at the beginning of the alphabet and they call your name 'Brown' and then they go down to 'J' or 'K', and you want to challenge somebody else's vote, you can't do it. I think that we can live with the Speaker's idea; but we don't have to abolish the right of any Member who might see something or see something happen on the floor that he thinks should be challenged to request a verification. So I would support this Amendment because I think it leaves things the way they are, that you have . . . you can still have the . . . the Speaker still can have the verified oral Roll Call, but on electrical Roll Calls and oral Roll Calls any Members can ask for a verification.

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. James Houlihan."<sup>31</sup>

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I respectfully disagree with the previous speaker. I think he misinterprets the reading of that particular Amendment, at least the reading of the rules without the Amendment. And I had originally voted 'yes', but in light of the Speaker's presentation, and I think the confidence that all of us can put into the Speaker, I would argue that we ought to give this a chance. It may well cut down the time we have to be here in Session. And it may give us a more orderly House, and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Walsh, have you explained your vote?"

Walsh: "Not yet . . ."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: ". . . The difficulty with this proposal as in House Joint Resolution 94 is that there is simply not sufficient time for a challenge. The Clerk goes through the Roll Call rather quickly, the Speaker would have to . . . or whoever the presiding officer is . . . would have to have eyes all over his head to recognize any one of a number of people who might be interested in challenging an individual vote. Now, as soon as the Clerk, according to the Resolution as written, as soon as the Clerk gets to the next name, then everyone is forever foreclosed from challenging the vote of someone whose light appears



on the board. Now that is not right, that is not a verified Roll Call. I suggest to you that we should not do this if what Mr. Deuster suggested . . . if we could verify following that oral Roll Call, then it would be all right. But if we cannot following that oral Roll Call, then it leaves room for a great deal of mischief and is all wrong. And I urge your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, first I would like the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to reiterate what Representative Houlihan said. I think you do misinterpret when it mentions the challenge, for example, if your name is called on the Roll Call, Representative Deuster, any one of us, if we don't see you can challenge your vote. It doesn't mean that when they come to your vote, that you stand up and vote and also challenge anybody. So I think you misinterpreted that. Now, I also think that we're making much to do about nothing. I don't think there's going to be that many instances when the Speaker is going to know beforehand - when something is going to be very contested and is going to order a verified Roll Call. So I think really it's worth it, this chance that the Speaker is trying . . . it's not going to be really used that much. We're . . . most of the time we're going to be using the alternative anyhow."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk shall take the record. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I want to verify the Roll Call, any way you want it."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there unanimous consent to employ the new method of verification on this Roll Call? Is there any objection to using the proposed new method to verify this Roll Call? Hearing no objection, the Clerk shall proceed to verify this Roll Call pursuant to the new proposal and the . . . the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I think to do that, he's got to take this Roll Call as the record, and then dump it so we use the new procedure. In other words





. . ."

Speaker Madigan: "There being unanimous consent, the Clerk shall proceed to call the Roll. Hearing an objection, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, who wishes to be recorded 'no'. Mr. Kelly wishes to be recorded as 'no'. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "At the present time, I withdraw my verification request."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "I request a verification, Mr. Speaker. But just a verification of the negative vote, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of time."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman is recorded . . . for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, arise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like a poll of the absentees, and I'd like to have the verification go about the properly orderly manner as required by the rule and . . . going to go right down the line."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall poll the absentees, and would . . . Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, the prevailing side in this case is the negative vote. So I would suggest that the Clerk should call them first."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk shall proceed to call the absentees. And would all Members be in their chairs."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt, Bradley, Brandt, Byers, Catania, Daniels, Ebbesen, Ewing, Getty, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Johnson, Kozubowski, Lauer, Luft, Madison, Mahar, Mann, Marovitz, Matejek, McAvoy, McBroom, McClain, McGrew, Miller, Mudd, Mugalian, Pierce, Richmond, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Sharp, Terzich, Tuerk, Van Duyne, Winchester, Wolf and Younge."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Van Duyne wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Record Mr. Van Duyne as 'no'. For what purpose does Mr. Walsh seek recognition?"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, it's after 11 o'clock. We've been here since 10:30 this morning. Why don't we take this out of the record, adjourn and consider this . . . I was just trying to be helpful, Mr. Speaker, so that . . ."



Speaker Madigan: ". . . We see you've tried to be helpful for yours."

Walsh: ". . . You'd rather not do that then?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of order I guess it would be; but it has been the practice of the Chair during this Session that once a Roll Call is taken, and a Member wants to get recorded that it require unanimous consent. And I wonder why we have suddenly deviated from that after we have taken a Roll Call . . ."

Speaker Madigan: "This is a verified Roll Call, Mr. Totten, which is an exception to that rule."

Totten: ". . . Well . . ."

Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk will proceed to poll the affirmative Roll Call, which is the provision in the rules. I'm informed by the Parliamentarian, Mr. Walsh, that the rule reads that we poll the affirmative Roll Call first. Where is the Parliamentarian? Will the Parliamentarian come to the Speaker's podium? The Parliamentarian informs me that at the current status of the Roll Call there are 66 'ayes' and 67 'nos'; and, therefore, we will poll the negative Roll Call first. Definitely, Mr. Walsh. Mr. Clerk, proceed to poll the negative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Brady, Breslin . . ."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Out of courtesy to Mr. Walsh, do you think the Members might be in their seats and raise their little hands when their name is being called to help Mr. Walsh out at this late hour."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Members please be seated to facilitate the verification of the Roll Call. Would the Members please be seated. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: ". . . Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Giglio, Greiman, Holewinski, Dañ Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Madigan, Peggy Martin, Matijeovich, Mautino, McLendon, McPike,



Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous, Pouncey, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Tipsword, Van Duynes, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Willer, Williams, Yourell; Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there questions? The Chair recognizes Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

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

Speaker Madigan: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, could I be recorded as 'aye', please?"

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Wolf as 'aye'. Are there questions of the negative Roll Call, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "Representative Brummer?"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Brummer is standing at his chair."

Walsh: "Domico?"

Speaker Madigan: "Domico is at his chair."

Walsh: "Flinn?"

Speaker Madigan: "Flinn is present, in his seat."

Walsh: "Is he there?"

Speaker Madigan: "He's in his seat."

Walsh: "Giglio?"

Speaker Madigan: "Giglio? He's in his chair."

Walsh: "O'Brien?"

Speaker Madigan: "O'Brien is in his chair."

Walsh: "Representative Giglio, is he there, Mr. Speaker? All right, we found him. O'Brien is in his chair?"

Speaker Madigan: "Right up against the wall, Bill."

Walsh: "Kornowicz?"

Speaker Madigan: "He's in his chair."

Walsh: "Stuffle?"

Speaker Madigan: "Stuffle is in his chair."

Walsh: "Jacobs?"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jacobs? Is the Gentleman in his chair or is the Gentleman in the chambers?"



Walsh: "Jim Taylor?"

Speaker Madigan: "Taylor, Mr. Taylor? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz. Mr. Marovitz wishes to be recorded as 'no'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "'Aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Daniels as 'aye'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Schneider. Record Mr. Schneider as 'no'. Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Have you taken Taylor and Jacobs off?"

Speaker Madigan: "I don't know if we have or not. Are either of those Gentlemen in the chambers? If they are not, remove them from the Roll Call."

Walsh: "They are removed then, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Taylor and Mr. Jacobs should be removed from the Roll Call. Mr. Richmond wishes to be recorded as 'no'; and Mr. Harris wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Thank you. Further questions, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Representative Terzich?"

Speaker Madigan: "Terzich? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Walsh: "Representative Kozubowski?"

Speaker Madigan: "How is Mr. Kozubowski recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as not voting."

Walsh: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker. Could you tell us what the count is, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Madigan: "On this question there are 69 'ayes', 69 'nos'; and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #40, Telcser, amends House Resolution 94 by striking Rule 17(b) and inserting in lieu, thereof, the following and so forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Would the Speaker return to the podium please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Where is we? Amendment 40? Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #40 was introduced after Representative Kane's Amendment #1 was adopted. You may



recall that during the discussion of Amendment #1, which Representative Kane offered, I expressed my concern about our side of the aisle or other Members having something to say regarding some Committee action which might take place. Amendment #1, you may also recall, deleted the provisions which stated that a Committee which may want to do some kind of action, have a hearing, hear Bills other than, as I interpret, other than Bills during the normal course of the Session, have to get that permission from the Committee on the Assignment of Bills. We adopted Representative Kane's Amendment, which deleted that language, left those as they were in last Session's rules. I would like to say that I discussed with Representative Kane my concern. I appreciated the time he gave me. And I might add he sincerely tried to see my point of view; but, unfortunately, we were unable to agree upon mutual language to protect the minority side of the aisle in this particular matter. Now, Amendment #40 states that in order for a Committee to initiate some particular action, the Committee Chairman would need the permission of the Minority Spokesman or it would require a vote of three-fifths of the Committee to initiate any such action. Now, I'm deeply concerned about the tremendous amount of power which we have now vested in the Committee Chairman, where a Committee Chairman, in my opinion, could unilaterally act to have his or her Committee engaged in some kind of legislative activity without necessarily the consent of the Committee Members in performing that particular action. I would also like to make this point. While the Amendment obviously takes the position of the Minority Party versus the Majority Party, that is, to give our people something to say as to what a Committee does, I would like to remind the Members of the majority side of the aisle that there may be times during the Session, and in fact I know there will be times, when you may not be in agreement with the Chairman of the Committee on which you serve, or where you may be interested in a particular piece of business which a Committee Chairman wants to get involved in. Your opinion may not be the same as that other Chairman of the Committee, and you may very well find yourself at odds with that particular Chairman. I believe with my Amendment you would have



someone else to go to. With the Amendment which I am offering, no Committee Chairman could unilaterally exert power which ought to be distributed to all Members of the Committee. While we were debating Representative Kane's Amendment, we discussed too much power being vested in one Committee. And over and over again in the discussion of the rules, we have talked about too much power in the hands of the Leadership, too much in the hands of a few people. Well if we don't adopt my Amendment, we will have put in the hands of Committee Chairman a great deal of power without any checks and balances, which they alone can exert. I am asking in this Amendment that that power be apportioned out to other Members of the Committee or shared equally with the Minority Spokesman. This is the only fair thing to do. And it follows the same rationale and same logic which Representative Kane argued when asking that we adopt Amendment #1. I am sincerely asking, not only the Members of my side of the aisle to support my motion, but I'm asking those of you on your . . . on the Democratic side of the aisle, the majority side of the aisle to think of themselves as not being in agreement with a Committee Chairman. If that's the case, you will have nowhere to go, you will have nothing to say regarding what a Committee would perhaps do other than hearing Bills under normal course of legislative Session. I think this Amendment has equity to Representative Kane's Amendment #1. It is fair, it is logical, it gives the power to the Members of the Committee. We talked over and over again about strengthening the Committee system, about strengthening the Members of the Committee, not only the Committee Chairman; we're not asking to place in the hands of 20 some odd people enormous powers, we're asking to disperse and dispense that power to the Members of the Committee, not to individuals. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I sincerely urge and request that you join me in my motion to adopt Amendment #40 to Resolution 94."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Katz, pardon me."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, about 40 Amendments ago and 12 hours ago we began these deliberations. Mr. Kane proposed an Amendment that struck certain language that the Rules



Committee had put into the rules. Well, it was the will of this House that that language go; and I personally acceded to the will of the House. The language went and all of a sudden 40 Amendments later it's back again, slightly revised form but the same language. Now, I propose that we accept what the House did on Amendment #1. The language is deleted from this. There are no new powers given Committee Chairman. Let's dispose of this matter. Vote this Amendment down and go home."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that some of the same arguments that were made in favor of Amendment #1 need to be made in opposition to Amendment #40. If this Amendment is adopted, the Committees will not be able to act. It's been alleged that these rules give tremendous powers to Committee Chairman. In fact, the only power that the Committee Chairman has is the power to call a meeting of the Committee. If a Chairman cannot call a meeting, all of his Committee, there's no point in having a Committee. The Leader on the other side of the aisle is essentially saying that he wants the Minority Spokesman to have veto power over the calling of Committee meetings. He wants to transfer the power of the Committee Chairman to call a meeting to the Minority Spokesman so that that Spokesman could have the power of vetoing such a meeting. I think that there have been no abuses of Committee Chairman powers this Session or last Session. I think the Committees are operating as well as they can be. And I'd urge the defeat of Amendment #40."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I can't understand why the need for this Amendment at this time. It does not, if we defeat this Amendment, give to Committees any powers that they have not always had in the past. This is simply trying to change what has always been true in Committees during the last term, and the term before and the term before that. Committees will have no different powers under the existing rules than they have had all the time heretofore. And it makes one wonder why the sudden rush now that we have to have a change in the rules in the operation of Committees. It appears to me that the



Committee should be given the opportunity and have the right to continue to act as they have in the past. And to continue to act with the continued cooperation and the continued vote of the Membership. There's nothing going to take place in Committees in the past, it hasn't . . . there's not going to be in the future that the Membership does not participate in. And I would suggest that it is unnecessary, it's unrealistic to have this change in the rules at this time. And that Committees should be unfettered and continue to operate as they have in the past when there has been Republican majority on them, and it should continue just the same when there's been Democratic . . . when there is Democratic majority on those Committees. I can see no reason for them to change now."

Speaker Redmond: "James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to commend Representative Telcser because he has been probably the only person tonight who has been consistent. He opened the evening with a partisan attack and he's now closing the evening with a partisan attack. It seems to me, Art, that there ought to be no place for partisan politics in the fair running of our Committee structures. We ought to maintain our Committee structures in the way that they are so that they can effectively . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman should re . . . that's right, you should . . . confine your remarks to the Amendment and don't be taking after my friend, Mr. Telcser, if you would please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: ". . . Representative, I'd like to remind the Majority Leader he ought not to use the Representative's, who is his friend, name in debate, the Minority Leader. Representative from Cook County, the district north of me, is trying to inhibit an effective means that the Committee structure has to look into issues, to examine the reasons and the causes for particular action. Now, he may want to cover up some action by the administrative . . . the administration, the current administration or he may want not to have the full light of day on the Committee hearings. But I suggest that we would not have Repre-





sentative Peters chairing and looking into the nutrition of the Chicago schools or the schools throughout the state if we had this kind of a rule currently. And I think Representative Telcser is out of order in this particular Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, only because my name was mentioned in debate here, I might suggest to the distinguished Representative and Vice-Chairman of the Appropriations Committee that, in fact, the Nutrition Committee that was constituted by Appropriations Committee II was constituted exactly in the conformance with the suggestion made in this rule. You voted for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz. State your point, it's 11:30."

Lechowicz: "My point, Mr. Speaker, is I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it . . . Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm sorry that the Gentleman from Cook has interjected a partisan flavor into this debate. I'm simply asking that the Committees participate in Committee decisions. The people who rose to their feet to speak in opposition to my Amendment talked about the Committee, the Committees functioning and the Committees doing something. All I want to do is to let the Committees do something and to let the Members of the Committees participate in decisions. The way the rules now stand it is the Committee Chairman who unilaterally can take that Committee anywhere he or she wishes to without the advice and consent of the Committee Members, let alone the minority people only. This House has historically in the last 4 to 5 years been dispersing power to the Members of the House. They're slowly taking power from the Speaker and from the Leaders and spreading it among the Members. That may be fine; but it's interesting to note that when those people who shouted the loudest and stomped their feet the most often for participatory democracy and dissipation of powers, when the power winds up in their lap, they want it to stop. They want that power to go to the Members of their Committees because they want to retain that power and they want to retain the trappings of the office as one of those across the



aisle told me during the course of our discussion. Your position on this Amendment if you oppose it is simply not sincere. It is the total opposite of what all of you have been talking about for years. Now I suggest that those of you who are sincerely concerned with full participation on the part of Members in this entire process vote 'yes' on Amendment #40."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #40. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Somebody voting Representative Skinner's switch? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Davis desires to be recorded as 'no'. Push Representative Davis' switch. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 63 'aye' and 75 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. Amendment 41."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #41, Skinner, amends House Resolution 94 on page 2, line 12, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Last hopefully last, maybe least, but nevertheless an Amendment that would be of concern to some people who are no longer with us and some that are with us is Amendment #41, which would require the Speaker to designate 'No Smoking' sections on each side of the aisle large enough to accommodate all non-smoking Members who wish to sit in such a section and prohibiting Members or other people from smoking in those areas. Now one of the first . . . one of the first things that I heard when I came to the General Assembly was a talk by Representative . . . former Representative Victor Arrigo pleading for his life while we were considering the House rules, asking for a 'No Smoking' section on the Democratic side of the aisle. I can't make this appeal as eloquently as his district mates could or his seat-mates could and did at the time, but he was asking for the right to breathe smoke-free air. Well our predecessors turned a deaf ear on his request and he's dead now. We may, those of us who were there and didn't vote for it, be partially responsible for his death. The issue is pretty simple. I would ask for your support for this Amendment which I would assume would not take affect until the next General



Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I share very much the feelings of Mr. Skinner with regards to smoke and non-smoke; but the seats have been assigned. I don't believe that anyone at this stage really wants to reassign seats in the House. I would urge the Gentleman to raise the matter at the Eighty-First General Assembly before the seats are assigned. It would be very impractical now to rearrange the seats. And so we would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "I wonder if Representative Skinner could explain his 'No Smoking' program with the present system of seniority selection of seats. If he could explain how that would work without . . . I withdraw the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question. I thought we did this two years ago and it worked out very well. And what happened to that?"

Skinner: "Representative Deuster, we have done it informally on the Republican side of the aisle, and it has worked out fairly well. But on the Democratic side of the aisle there is no 'No Smoking' section. And I assure you there are Members who may wish or may not wish to speak who would desire such a 'No Smoking' section to be officially designated."

Deuster: "Well, I'd like to speak to it. I think it's an excellent suggestion. And it will not apply until the next General Assembly; but the problem is when we come in we always function for a while on the previous rules. If we adopt this now, we will provide the foundation for the Speaker assigning this area when the next General Assembly comes in. I urge a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner to close."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly not asking for anyone to give up their seats at this time or any rearrangement; but I do know that I made an attempt to . . . I did contact you as a matter of fact, asking that you do so informally and unfortunately it didn't get done. I



would just ask for an affirmative vote of . . . on the Resolution. If anybody thinks it needs to be changed on the face to make it quite obvious that it will not be changed until the next General Assembly, fine, let's put it on the face. If not, I'd appreciate it for next time around."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #41. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the motion fails. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, tonight early in the Session all of the Members of the House have given up a great deal of time, and I want to express real appreciation from the Speaker for your willingness to do so. We have gone through 41 Amendments. We had long hearings of the Rules Committee. I would want to thank the Republican Leadership who sat through that as well as the Democratic Leaders. We have now come to the end of that difficult and laborious process, I would move, Mr. Speaker, for the adoption of House Resolution 94 as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I have already commended the Rules Committee; but I want to personally commend you for keeping us here. It was tough, but I think that in my time I doubt if there's any other Legislative Session that adopted rules this early. You made us stay here and do it. And I commend you for it, and I think the rest of the Members probably commend you too."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' . . . Representative Totten."

Totten: "Could I be recorded as 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Not yet, not yet. He's recorded as 'aye'."

Totten: "Well . . . I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, if I may, that in reviewing 50(a) and 50(b) that a Member who does receive unanimous consent when asked to be recorded, and somebody objects, could then



ask on your 50(b) for a verification of the Roll Call or for a poll of the absentees which becomes a more delaying process. And that's what I was trying to do there; but I didn't catch it when we were debating 50(a) and 50(b). But I think that we may have that difficulty with the rules, which could be considerably more delaying than what was intended."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there are 119 'aye' and 19 'nay'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails, and the House Resolution 94 is adopted. And I may say . . . thank all the Members for staying, and I would like to compliment the new Members, the 41 of them, because they have come and helped us. We are now one year and a half ahead of the record of the Seventy-First . . . Seventy-Ninth Session. So that's . . . if all goes well, we'll be out of here real early I'm sure, Memorial Day. Agreed Resolutions. Representative Madigan, do you seek recognition? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Which Memorial Day?"

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Schlickman: "Which Memorial Day?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. Representative Madigan, are you seeking recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I thought we might call upon the Committee Chairmen for announcements."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Announcements. Committee Chairmen, announcements. Announcements, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of you have been the recipients of a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars inviting you to their banquet next Tuesday night. So if you haven't responded to their letter, if you'll give me your name tomorrow here, I'll check you out and see that you get your ticket. I'll mention it again tomorrow. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other announcements by Committee Chairmen? Agreed Resolutions, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, since we did adopt House Resolution 94 and there is a tremendous amount of harmony on both sides of the aisle. Agreed Resolution #100 offered by Representatives Madigan and Schneider



is in behalf of the Speaker of the House in celebrating for he and his wife 34 years of holy matrimony. I'd like to ask leave of the House that all Members be Co-sponsors of the Resolution and have the Clerk read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 100, 'Whereas, those among the people of Illinois to provide happy, healthful and secure environments for their families; and those lovebirds bind them together for long periods of time are worthy of the respect and admiration of each of the people; and, whereas, Speaker William Redmond and his bride, Rita, were joined in holy matrimony on March 6, 1943; and, whereas, Speaker and Mrs. Redmond resided in Bensenville where they gave their children, Mary, William and Coleen, the best possible start in life through their affection and respect; and where they now enjoy the comfort of two grandchildren and Coleen and William Patrick; and, whereas, William Redmond, with the help and support of his lovely wife, Rita, has represented his constituents in the 40th District since 1959, and was elected to serve as Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-Ninth and Eightieth General Assembly; and, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we commend William and Rita Redmond for their achievement of 34 years of married life and upon the contribution which they have made to the people of the State of Illinois; and be it further resolved that we join their family and friends in congratulating them on the celebration of the 34th year of healthy, happiness and prosperity to come; and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to the Speaker and Mrs. Redmond as a token of the respect and regard of this House for . . . of Representatives'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in the true tradition, I want to wish you and your wife many, many more happy years together. House Resolution 101 offered by Representative Wall is congratulating Jeff Pikowski upon receiving the Eagle Scout Award. House Resolution 102 offered by Representative Chapman congratulates the bowling team of Forest View High School on winning the Illinois High School Girls Bowling



Title. House Resolution 103 offered by Representatives Hart-Richmond honors Clark Davis who retired from Southern Illinois University in Carbondale. House Resolution 104 offered by Representatives Boucek and Walsh honors Mr. Walter Bucki, Village President of Willow Springs. House Resolution 105 offered by Representative Wikoff honors Paul Behrends upon attaining the rank of Eagle Scout. House Resolution 106 by Representative Wikoff honors Chris Creek on attaining the rank of Eagle Scout. House Resolution 107 by Jane Barnes honors Robert Robinson on attaining the rank of Eagle Scout. House Resolution 108 by Representative Jane Barnes honors Donald McKenna upon attaining the rank of Eagle Scout. House Resolution 109 by Jane Barnes honors James Cronin on attaining the rank of Eagle Scout. House Resolution 110 by Representative Giglio honors Mr. and Mrs. D'Adam on 50 years on their Golden Wedding Anniversary. House Resolution 111 by Representative Matejek honors the Polish American Police Association. House Resolution 114 offered by Representative Madigan honors the Louis Pasteur School on their 50th Anniversary of its opening. And House Joint Resolution, Mr. Speaker, #13 by Representative Katz that there be created a Joint Rules Committee consisting of five Members of the House appointed by the Speaker and five Members of the Senate appointed by the Senate Committee on Committees with no more than three House Members and three Senate Members may be of the majority party in the respective House. And I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 14, Kelly. House Joint Resolution 15, Byers. House Joint Resolution 16, Byers. House Joint Resolution 17, Conti. House Resolution 98, Robinson. House Resolution 99, Pierce. House Resolution 112, Terzich. And House Resolution 113, Madigan."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I was just informed that on House Joint Resolution



13, which was adopted by a voice vote, will require 89 votes. And I would like to remove that and make sure . . . and put it on the Speaker's Table."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections to removing . . . which one was it? . . ."

Lechowicz: "House Joint Resolution 13."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . Okay . . . hearing no objections, it will be removed and put on the Speaker's Table."

Lechowicz: "And House Resolution 113."

Speaker Redmond: "And 113 also. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, is it correct that House Resolution 113 is on the Speaker's Table?"

Speaker Redmond: "Right."

Madigan: "And would the Clerk verify that he has on file a motion by myself relative to House Bill 616?"

Clerk O'Brien: "It's journalized, it will be on the Calendar tomorrow."

Madigan: "Thank you. Would the Clerk announce his program for the remainder of the day?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Five minutes Perfunctory Session then adjourn."

Madigan: "And I move to adjourn until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Five minutes Perfunctory, at which time we'll adjourn until 1:30 tomorrow afternoon. Again, thank you very much."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports. Representative Mann, Chairman from the Committee on Judiciary I to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken March 9, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation, 'do pass' House Bills 339, 388 and 389, 'do pass' Consent Calendar House Bill 328. Introduction and First Reading. House Bill 654, Stuffle-Lucco, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 655, Terzich-Chapman-Catania-Dyer, a Bill for an Act in relation to employment discrimination. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 656, Terzich-Chapman-Catania-Dyer, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 657, Terzich-Catania-Chapman-Dyer, a Bill for





an Act in relation to discrimination in granting benefits to surviving spouses. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 658, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act in relation to educational opportunity discrimination. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 659, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act in relation to discrimination towards certain veterans. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 660, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act in relation to discrimination of real property ownership and disposition. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 661, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 662, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to acquisition, control, maintenance, improvement and protection of state parks and nature preserves. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 663, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 664, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to authorize townships to levy taxes for the purpose of maintaining and operating public, non-sectarian hospitals. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 665, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Hospital District Law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 666, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to construction of the statutes. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 667, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 668, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act in relation to employment in mines . . . employment in mines. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 669, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create a division of the Office of the Attorney General. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 670, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 671, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in regard to evidence and disposition. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 672, Terzich et al, a Bill for an Act relating to sex discrimination and criminal law. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 673, Porter, a Bill for



an Act to provide for civil commitment for mental treatment of persons accused of crimes and found in need of mental treatment. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 674, Deuster, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 675, E. G. Steele, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to Fire Protection Districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 676, E. G. Steele, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to Fire Protection Districts. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 677, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 678, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 679, Dyer, a Bill for an Act to clarify the powers and duties of the non-voting student members of various boards of institutions of higher education. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 680, Pullen, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act define the . . . to define the nature of all transactions relating to procuring, furnishing, donating, processing, distributing or using human blood. First Reading of the Bill. No further introductions. The House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	10:30	Doorkeeper	
		Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from the Senate
		Speaker Redmond	
2		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 13, Second Reading, One Committee Amendments
	10:35	Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
3		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 40, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 185, Second Reading, Two Committee Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:40	Luft	Amendment #1
4		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Luft	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 adopted, Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 204, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 235, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 237, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
5		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Lechowicz	Bring House Bill 237 to Second
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Leave it on Third Reading
	10:45	Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 243, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 244, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
6		Speaker Redmond	
	10:47	Lucco	Motion to reconsider vote on Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Lechowicz )	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewing	
7		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries, leave on Second
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 251, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 255, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matjevich	Objects to unauthorized persons on House floor
8	10:52	Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 256, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 277, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dunn, J.	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.)	Explain Amendment
		)	
9		Dunn, J. )	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell )	Yield?
		)	
		Dunn, J.)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dunn, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 279, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
	11:00	Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
10		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 287, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 301, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 327, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
		Simms	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 330, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
	11:01	Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
11		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 342, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 351, Second Reading, No Committee Amendments
		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 40, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
	11:04	Speaker Redmond	
		Griesheimer	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
12		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 131, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wall	Speaks for Huskey on Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted, Third Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 54, Third Reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
13		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 276, Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
14		Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Sevcik )	Question
		)	
15		Holewinski)	
	11:14	Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis )	Yield?
		)	
16		Holewinski)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Speaks on the Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff )	
		)	
17		Holewinski)	
		Speaker Redmond	
18	11:18	Huff	Addresses the Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
19		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber)	Yield?
		)	
20		Holewinski )	
21	11:29	Leinenweber	Speaks on Bill



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
22		Holewinski	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
23	11:34	Deuster	Explains 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
24		Sanquist	
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:35	Huff	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
25		Epton	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 276 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 317, Third Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
26	11:40	Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 317 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction, First Reading, House Bills 615 and 616
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Leave to advance Bills to Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Hold for Madigan





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Excused absence
27		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	Tickets, etc.
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:45	Stearney	
28		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
29		Stearney	House Bill 286, motion
		Speaker Redmond	
30	11:50	Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Willer	Urges 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	Speaks in favor
		Speaker Redmond	
		McAuliffe	Moves previous question
31		Speaker Redmond	
		Stearney	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Catania	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stearney	Continues
		Speaker Redmond	
32		Matijevich	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Stearney	
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:55	Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Speaks in favor
		Speaker Redmond	
33		Meyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:59	Katz	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Redmond	Motion prevails
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 256, Second Reading, One Committee Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	
34		Telcser	Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Asks Telcser to hold
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record, House Bill 10 to Second for Amendment
	11:02	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6
35		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	Objects to Amendment
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
36		Davis, C.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Favors
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan)	Yield?
		)	
	12:10	Madison)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
38		McAuliffe	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
39	12:12	Madison	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment fails, Third Reading
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		)	
		Ryan )	Motion, House Bills 615 and 616
		Speaker Redmond	
40		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	12:16	Giorgi	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Satterthwaite	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
41		Hart	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:20	Mudd	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
42		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries
	12:24	Barnes, G.	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
43		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Question to Ryan
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Responds
		Speaker Redmond	
44		Madison)	Discussion
		)	
		Ryan )	
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:26	Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
45		Hart	Demo. Conf.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 301, Second Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, Third Reading
46	12:30	Hart	30 minute recess
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction, First Reading
	2:16	Speaker Redmond	House in order
47, 48		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction, First Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Introductions
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Doorkeeper	
49	2:36	Speaker Redmond	Question
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	Question
		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
	2:40	Ryan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Question
50		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
51		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
	2:43	Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
52		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	Motion carries, recess until 6:00
		Kosinski	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	Announcement
		Speaker Redmond	
53	2:45	Cunningham	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Laurino	No Elections Committee
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
	2:47	Laurino	
		Doorkeeper	
	6:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
54		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction, First Reading
		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 10
		Schlickman	Lie on the Table
		Speaker Redmond	
55		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	Unfair
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	House Resolution 94
		Madison )	Question
56		Speaker Redmond)	
		Katz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
57		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
58		Willer	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		)	
		Geo-Karis )	
		)	
		Kane )	
		)	
		Geo-Karis)	
		Speaker Redmond	
59		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	Yield?
		Speaker Redmond	Proceed
60		Telcser)	Question
		)	
		Kane )	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
61		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	Yield?
		Speaker Redmond	
62		Houlihan, J.)	Question
		)	
63		Kane )	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
64	6:33	Tipsword	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	Brandt moves previous question
65		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
66		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	Point of parliamentary inquiry
		Kane	Change on face
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Another error
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
67		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Continues
	6:42	Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
68		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	On Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	Question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
69		Telcser	Urge 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
	6:49	Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Satterthwaite)	Yield?
		)	
71		Kane )	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	Moves previous question
	6:52	Speaker Redmond	
72		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
73		Hart	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
	6:57	Tipsword	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
74		McPike	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Poll absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Withdraws request
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 fails
	7:00	Schlickman	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
75		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
		Speaker Redmond	
76		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
77		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle)	Yield?
		)	
78		Kane )	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.)	Yield?
		)	
79		Kane )	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wikoff	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Yourell	
80		Kane	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schuneman	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
81		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment \$4
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
82		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
83		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		)	
		Wolf )	
		)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		)	
84		Matijevich )	
		)	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
85		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
86		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Madison )	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Reed	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
87		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #4 fails
	7:30	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Walsh )	
		Speaker Redmond	Urges support
88		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #5 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6
		Speaker Redmond	
89		Greiman	
		Speaker Redmond	
90		Hudson	Opposes Amendment #6
	7:37	Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	7:40	Greiman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
91		Cunningham	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
92		Macdonald	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
93		Kempiners	Support's
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dunn, J.	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
94		Friedrich	Votes 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
95	7:52	Davis, C.	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
96		Deuster	Against
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:55	Willer	
		Speaker Redmond	
97		Sandquist	Urges 'aye' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
98		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #7
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
99		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
100		Bowman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #7
	8:07	Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
101		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	Urges 'aye' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #7 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #8
		Speaker Redmond	
102		Marovitz	Amendment #8
		Speaker Redmond	
103		Simms	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
104		Hanahan	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
105		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
106		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #8 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #9
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	Leave to table Amendment #9
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
	8:25	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #10
		Speaker Redmond	
107, 108		Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
109		Collins	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
110	8:30	Houlihan, D.	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lauer	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
111	8:35	Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #10 fails; Amendment #11
112		Clerk O'Brien	
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
113		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
114		Madison	To close
	8:43	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #11 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #12
		Speaker Redmond	
115		Houliha, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #12 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #13
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #13 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #14
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #14 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #15



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
116		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #16
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	Explains Amendment #16
		Speaker Redmond	
117		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #16 passes
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #17
118		Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	Explains Amendment #17
		Speaker Redmond	
119		Greiman	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
120		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Walsh	
121		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	Opposes



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	Point of personal privilege
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
122		Porter	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #18
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
123		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
	9:05	Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #18 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #19
		Speaker Redmond	
124		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Against
		Speaker Redmond	
125		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Davis	
	9:10	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #19 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #20
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	Leave to table
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #21
		Speaker Redmond	
126		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
127	9:15	Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
128		Barnes, G.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
129	9:20	Walsh	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #21
		Ewell	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #21 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #22
		Speaker Redmond	
130		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
131		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	Urges 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
132		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #22 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #23
		Speaker Redmond	
	9:29	Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
133		Schlickman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #23 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #24
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
134		Matijeovich)	Yield?
		)	
		Schlickman)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Leave to amend on its face
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #24 adopted
	9:34	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #25



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
135		Greiman	
		Speaker Redmond	
136		Katz	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #25 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #26
		Speaker Redmond	
137		Greiman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	
138		Speaker Redmond	
	9:42	Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
139	9:43	Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
140		Willer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
141	9:50	Totten ) Greiman) Speaker Redmond Keats	Yield
142		Speaker Redmond Skinner Speaker Redmond Greiman	
143	9:52	Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Greiman Speaker Redmond	Amendment #26 fails Amendment #27
144		Katz Speaker Redmond	
145	10:57	Totten Speaker Redmond Deuster	
146		Speaker Redmond Greiman Speaker Redmond Ryan Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Greiman Speaker Redmond	To close Amendment #27 fails Introduction Amendment #28 Leave to table Amendment #28
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #29
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	Leave to table Amendment #29
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #30
		Speaker Redmond	
147		Greiman	Leave to table Amendment #30
	10:03	Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #31
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		)	
148		Greiman )	Amendment #31
		Katz	
		Houlihan, J.	
	10:07	Speaker Redmond	Amendment #31 lost
149		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #32
		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	Leave to table Amendment #32
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #33
		Speaker Redmond	
		Chapman	Leave to table Amendment #33
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #34
		Speaker Redmond	
		Walsh	Leave to table Amendment #34





<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #35
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #35 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #36
		Speaker Redmond	
150	10:10	Kent	Amendment #36
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
151		Matijevid	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Collins	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
152		Keats	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #36 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #37
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:16	Schuneman	Amendment #37
		Speaker Redmond	
153		Matijevid	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich)	Question
		)	
		Schuneman)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
154		Wolf	Urges 'no' vote
		Speaker Redmond	
155		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:25	Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
156		Schuneman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
157		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:30	Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dunn, R.	
		Speaker Redmond	
158		Schuneman	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	Explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #37 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #38



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
159, 160		Bowman	
	10:35	Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Opposes
161		Speaker Redmond	
	10:40	Bowman	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #38 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #39
		Speaker Redmond	
162		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
163		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Walsh	To close
	10:45	Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
164		Simms	
		Speaker Redmond	Dump Roll Call
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
165	10:50	Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti	
		Speaker Madigan	
166		Speaker Redmond	Speaks on Amendment #39
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
167	10:55	Deuster	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Madigan	
168		Walsh	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Madigan	
169		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Lechowicz	Withdraws verification
		Speaker Madigan	
		Walsh	Requests verification
		Speaker Madigan	
		Lechowicz	Poll the absentees
		Speaker Madigan	
		Walsh	
		Lechowicz	Verification
		Speaker Madigan	
		Walsh	
	11:01	Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
170		Walsh	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Totten	Point of order
		Speaker Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls negative Roll Call
		Simms	
171		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Madigan	
		Winchester	Votes 'aye'
		Speaker Madigan	
	11:12	Wolf	
		Speaker Madigan	
172		Walsh )	Questions negative Roll Call
		)	
		Speaker Madigan)	
		Daniels	Votes 'aye'
		Speaker Madigan	
		Walsh	
		Harris	Change from 'yes' to 'no'
		Speaker Madigan	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Madigan	Amendment #39 fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #40
		Speaker Redmond	
173, 174	11:16	Telcser	Amendment #40
		Speaker Redmond	
175		Katz	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
176	11:25	Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Redmond	
177	11:30	Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Moves previous question
		Speaker Redmond	
178	11:31	Telcser	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #40 fails
	11:35	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #41
		Speaker Redmond	
179		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Simms	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
180		Skinner	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #41 fails
		Katz	Moves for adoption of House Resolution 94
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:38	Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
181		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	House Resolution 94 adopted
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
182		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	Announcements
		DiPrima	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Agreed Resolutions
183		Clerk O'Brien	Reads
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Joint Resolutions
184		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
185, 186		Clerk O'Brien )	
		Madigan )	Request
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	(Perfunct) Reads Committee Reports, First Readings; House adjourned

